DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 966 UD 023 092

TITLE	ESEA Title I Program. Interim Report, 1982.
INSTITUTION	Vazquez-Nuttall Associates, Inc., Newton, MA.
SPONS AGENCY	Boston Public Schools, Mass.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	113p.; For related document, see UD 023 077.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Financial Problems; *Needs Assessment; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Programs; School Policy
IDENTIFIERS	*Cutback Management; Massachusetts (Boston)

ABSTRACT

This interim process evaluation report focuses on the impact of funding cuts on Boston's 1981-82 Title I program, possible areas for further cutbacks, and several policy issues. Results of questionnaires completed by administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals as well as interviews and classroom observations were all used in the evaluation. Overall, individualized instruction was seen as the program's greatest strength. Staff development needs included more materials for English-as-a-second-language students and students with low motivation, and improved classroom management techniques. Despite cutbacks, morale was quite high, the reduction of clerical aides was felt as a minor burden, and the reduction of paraprofessionals did not affect the program a great deal. The area that was seen as most able to afford further cutbacks was materials and supplies. Personnel cutbacks viewed as suitable were in the number of community liaison aides, central administrators, and secondary paraprofessionals. Regarding possible grade cuts, the consensus was that Grades 4-7 were crucial. Reading labs were regarded as more cost effective than regular Title I classes but less professionally enjoyable. As for policy issues, more than half the principals felt that continued parental involvement was important. The majority of respondents in elementary schools wanted to retain the pull-out instructional model, while a substantial minority at the secondary level would prefer that Title I be offered as regularly scheduled instruction. Personnel in schools overwhelmingly preferred that different readers should be used in the Title I and the regular program. Fifty-four percent of Title I teachers reported that they were already certified in reading, and 14 percent were working toward certification. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED238966

Vázquez, Nuttall Associates, Inc.

"Research & Evaluation in Social Sciences, Health & Education"

INTERIM REPORT

ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM

Project Number: 429 (82)

1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Margaret M. Callahan
Boston Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Submitted to:

Boston Public Schools
Title I Office of Research and Evaluation
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts

Submitted by:

Vazquez-Nuttall Associates, Inc.
106 Washington Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02158
(617) 965-0240

UD 023092

MARGARET M. CALLAHAN
Chapter I Program
26 Court St., 3rd fl.
Boston, MA 02108

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY I

Introduction. I

Evaluation Design II

Major Findings. III

Major Recommendations V

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION 2

III. EVALUATION DESIGN 4

A. Interviews. 7

B. Questionnaires. 7

C. Observations. 10

IV. ELEMENTARY PROGRAM. 12

A. Program Description 12

B. Perceived Strengths - Elementary. 22

C. Perceived Effects of FY1982 Cutbacks. 26

D. Policy Issues 33

E. Suggested Changes 41

V. MIDDLE SCHOOL READING/LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM 42

A. Program Description 42

B. Perceived Strengths - Middle School 51

C. Perceived Effects of FY1982 Cutbacks. 54

D. Policy Issues 60

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

VI. HIGH SCHOOL. 66

A. Program Description 66

B. Perceived Strengths - High School 72

C. Perceived Effects of FY1982 Cutbacks. 74

D. High School Student Perceptions of Title I Program. 78

E. Policy Issues 80

VII. SPECIAL PROGRAMS. 83

A. New Century Education Corporation Reading Labs. 83

B. Potentially Gifted Program. 87

VIII. SYSTEM-WIDE POLICY ISSUES 90

A. Reading Certification Status of Current Title I Teachers. 90

B. Potential Areas to Cut the Title I Program. 93

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS 95

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 - Enrollment of Title I Students - Districts II, III, and VI. . 6

TABLE 2 - Interview Data Sources. 7

TABLE 3 - Response Rate of Questionnaires - Elementary Schools . . . 8

TABLE 4 - Response Rate of Questionnaires - Middle Schools. 8

TABLE 5 - Response Rate of Questionnaires - High Schools. 9

TABLE 6 - On-Site Observations - Elementary Schools 10

TABLE 7 - On-Site Observations - Middle Schools 10

TABLE 8 - On-Site Observations - High Schools 11

TABLE 9 - Implementation Dates - Elementary Schools 13

TABLE 10 - Types of Title I Classroom Facilities 14

TABLE 11 - Frequency of Observed Teaching Techniques 17

TABLE 12 - Role of Paraprofessionals 19

TABLE 13 - Student Activities Observed 20

TABLE 14 - Response Rate of Questionnaires - Elementary. 22

TABLE 15 - Major Strengths - Elementary School Staff Responses 24

TABLE 16 - Number of Teachers and Paraprofessionals. 27

TABLE 17 - Effects of Paraprofessional Reductions - Elementary 27

TABLE 18 - Effects of Elimination of Clerical Aides - Elementary . . . 29

TABLE 19 - Morale of Title I Staff - Elementary. 31

TABLE 20 - Pull-Out as Major Program Model 34

TABLE 21 - Elementary Staffs Alternatives to Pull-Out Model. 36

TABLE 22 - Importance of Parental Involvement. 38

TABLE 23 - Basal Reading Series - Usage in regular classroom 39

TABLE 24 - Suggested Changes by Elementary School Respondents. 41

TABLE 25 - Implementation Dates - Middle School. 43

TABLE 26 - Types of Title I Middle School Facilities 44

TABLE 27 - Frequency of Observed Teaching Techniques 47
TABLE 28 - Observed Paraprofessional Role. 48
TABLE 29 - Frequency of Specific Activities Observed 49
TABLE 30 - Response Rate of Questionnaires - Middle Schools. 51
TABLE 31 - Major Strengths - Middle School Staff Response. 52
TABLE 32 - Number of Teachers and Paraprofessionals. 55
TABLE 33 - Effects of Reduction of Paraprofessionals - Middle Schools. 55
TABLE 34 - Effects of Elimination of Clerical Aides - Middle School. . 57
TABLE 35 - Morale of Title I Staff - Middle School 58
TABLE 36 - Pull-Out as Major Program Model for Title I - Middle School 60
TABLE 37 - Middle School Staffs Alternatives to Pull-Out Model 63
TABLE 38 - Importance of Parental Involvement - Middle School. 65
TABLE 39 - Dates of Implementation - High School 67
TABLE 40 - Classroom Types for Title I - High Schools. 68
TABLE 41 - Instructional Activities Observed 69
TABLE 42 - Observed Paraprofessional Roles - High School 70
TABLE 43 - Specific Student Activities Observed - High School. 70
TABLE 44 - Response Rate of Questionnaires - High School 72
TABLE 45 - Major Strengths - High School staff Responses 73
TABLE 46 - Number of Teachers and Paraprofessionals. 75
TABLE 47 - Effects of Reduction of Paraprofessionals 75
TABLE 48 - Effects of Elimination of Clerical Aides. 76
TABLE 49 - Morale of Title I Staff - High Schools. 77
TABLE 50 - High School Students Perceptions of Title I Program 78
TABLE 51 - "How do you feel about leaving your regular classes...?". . 79
TABLE 52 - "Should the pull-out model be continued?" 80
TABLE 53 - Enrollments in NCEC Reading Labs in Evaluation Districts. . 83
TABLE 54 - Reading Certification Status of Title I Teachers. 91

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Title I program of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) provides funding for supplementary skills training programs for disadvantaged students. The program is now 12 years old and services over 12,000 children in the city of Boston in 140 schools at the elementary, middle and high school levels.

This mid-year interim evaluation report focuses on the process of the Title I Program as observed by the evaluator and reported by program participants. A final report at the end of the school year, will include a summative evaluation with an analysis of the results of achievement tests and performance objectives used to measure student progress.

The predominant model for the program has been that of pulling children out of regular classes for remedial help, one school period per day. At some middle and high schools, however, Title I is offered as a major credited subject instead of a pullout.

The predominant method of remediation has been individualized instruction in small group situations with the Title I teacher assisted by a paraprofessional (full or part time). However a program at the elementary and middle school level - the New Century Lab Program (NCEC) has been able to service larger numbers of children at the same time through the use of self-paced audio cassette materials. This program is somewhat more effective in raising students' standardized achievement scores than the regular program. Another special program, the Potentially Gifted Program at the Holland elementary school, offers selected children three extra Title I sessions per week with an aim to develop their academic and leadership promise.

The evaluation of Boston's Title I Programs is intended to provide Title

I staff, school administrators, and the public with descriptions of the current program and recommendations for the future.

Because there was a cutback in Title I funding for the 1981-1982 school year, several evaluation questions addressed the effects of those cutbacks. Similarly, as the federal government continues to decrease funding for the program the evaluator was asked to recommend areas where additional cutbacks could be made.

The Boston school administration is also considering several policy issues: whether to substitute a different program model for the "pull-out" model, whether to use the same reading text in Title I as in the regular program, and whether to maintain present efforts to involve parents in the Title I program. Because the state is mandating that all Title I teachers be certified in reading by June of 1983, we also tried to gauge the current status of reading certification among Title I teachers.

Evaluation Design

The methods of data collection used for this evaluation to date have been classroom observations, questionnaires, and interviews. The Boston Publis Schools administration, decided that the evaluation effort this year would be focused on districts II, III, and VI. All principals or headmasters, Title I teachers and paraprofessionals in Title I schools in these three districts were sent questionnaires. The Title I evaluation coordinators in each school were sent a number of questionnaires for non-Title I teachers equal to twice the number of Title I teachers in that school. At the high school level, the evaluation coordinator in each school was sent a set of questionnaires for Title I students equal to five times the number of Title I teachers in that school. All questionaires were were answered anonymously and were returned to Vazquez-Nuttall Associates in stamped self-addressed envelopes.

The number of returns and percent of those mailed were as follows.

	Elementary		Middle		High School	
	Returns		Returns		Returns	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Principals/Headmasters	27	(73%)	6	(46%)	1	(33%)
Title I teachers	50	(68%)	18	(72%)	6	(86%)
Paraprofessionals	29	(64%)	9	(64%)	1	(20%)
Non-Title I teachers	73	(49%)	17	(34%)	5	(35%)
Students	-		-		30	(83%)

In addition 13 Title I administrators were interviewed and one parents meetings and eight teacher workshops were attended.

Major Findings

In most elementary and high schools, the Title I program this year was well under way by the end of September but was delayed by two to four weeks at the middle school level.

Considering the cutbacks that have been made in the Title I program and in the Boston school system as a whole, it is perhaps surprising that morale in the Title I program was reported to be quite high.

The elimination of the clerical aide positions this year has been reported to be only a minor burden, felt somewhat greater at the elementary level than at the secondary level. The reduction in the number of paraprofessionals this year has not affected the program a great deal, with only current paraprofessionals noting a serious effect.

More than half of the principals/headmasters at all levels reported they felt parent involvement to be important, though in interviews many felt that

channels other than school level PACs would serve to maintain parental involvement.

Although there were some scheduling problems, the strong majority of all elementary school respondents wanted to retain the pull-out model without changes. At the middle and high school levels a substantial minority supported an alternate model of having Title I offered as a regularly scheduled subject.

The aspects of Title I most often mentioned as strengths were its individualized instruction. Small group instruction was the second most frequently noted strength.

Staff development needs involved materials for English as a Second Language students, materials for students with low motivation levels, and classroom management techniques. At the secondary level it was suggested that Title I offer workshops to regular teachers on how to teach reading in subject matter areas.

Of the 74 teachers responding to our questionnaire 54 percent were already certified in reading and 14 percent reported they were working toward certification. The remaining 32 percent either did not respond or did not indicate that they were either certified or working toward certification. Certification proportions were highest at the high school level, and the uncertified elementary teachers were considerably more likely to be seeking certification than the noncertified middle school teachers.

Among elementary school respondents there was an overwhelming opinion in favor of Title I having a <u>different</u> basal reader series than that used in the regular classes.

In terms of possible areas for further cutbacks, the areas of materials and supplies received highest support. Other areas of potential cutbacks were

community liaison aides, central administrators, and paraprofessionals at the secondary level. Regarding possible reduction in the grades being served, grades 4 through 7 were seen as crucial, with grades 12 and 11 most expendable. Controversy exists about the relative value of grades 1-3 and 8-10, with the secondary people in favor of dropping 1-3 and the elementary people in favor of dropping 8-10. The NCEC labs were recognized as cost effective, but not as professionally enjoyable to conduct as regular Title I classes.

Major Recommendations

The major recommendations were that the pull-out model be retained as the primary Title I service model for the elementary schools but at the secondary level, where possible, Title I should be offered as a regularly scheduled class in addition to English. After school, before school, and summer Title I programs do not offer much promise due to bussing problems.

The NCEC labs should be greatly expanded, perhaps becoming the major instructional model for Boston Title I. These labs have been proven to be educationally effective and have operating costs about half those of regular Title I. With the need to maintain services to as many students as possible with reduced funding, the NCEC labs can efficiently do this. However, the real concerns of the teachers involved in these labs should be addressed by having a minor portion of each week's activity being small group instruction.

To cut costs, supplies and materials should be reduced, community liaison positions should be dropped, and, except for NCEC labs, paraprofessionals at the secondary level should be greatly reduced. Paraprofessionals should be retained at the elementary level. Further cuts are possible in Title I central administration and in the staff development positions.

The relationships between Title I and special education and bilingual and ESL programs should continue to be carefully examined.

I. INTRODUCTION

Last year Vazquez-Nuttall Associates evaluated the Boston Public Schools Secondary Title I Program. In addition to analyzing student test data, we focused on the general operations of the program including communications among participants, in-service workshops, and curriculum materials.

This year we were selected to evaluate the elementary as well as secondary Title I programs. In addition to observing classrooms to see the general operation of the program, we have focused on two broad areas of policy concern. One is the impact of financial cutbacks, and the other involves potential program changes.

This interim report focuses on the operation of the program during the first half of the school year and perceptions of participants to date. The major portion of our data collection activities commenced in early January after we received the signed contract. Data was collected through a combination of classroom visits, interviews and questionnaires. All schools will be visited by the end of the year. At this point we have visited twenty-nine out of fifty-four schools.

Findings are reported by school levels - elementary, middle and high school. In addition there are evaluation reports on two special programs, the NCEC Reading Lab programs and a pilot Potentially Gifted Program at the Holland School.

Summative evaluation of student achievement will be available in late June after students have been post-tested. In addition, process evaluation results will be updated in the final report.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION - General

Title I is part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The main purpose of the program is to give federal aid to educationally disadvantaged childen from low income areas.

Every year Boston is surveyed to find the number of low-income families in each of the city's 861 population units or geocodes. Those district schools having a high concentration of low income residents are eligible for Title I services. Once a school is eligible for Title I services, all students in that school are eligible. In the non-district or magnet schools, all students living in an eligible geocode are eligible for Title I.

During the 1981-82 school year Title I instruction is provided to approximately 12,000 pupils in 140 Boston schools. Instruction is occuring in grades one through twelve at the following levels:

Number of Schools Receiving Title I services 1981-82

Elementary: 64 public, 31 private

Middle: 22 public, 9 private

High School: 10 public, 4 private

Within schools those children having the greatest educational need are eligible for Title I services. Students accepted into the program score below the fortieth percentile on the Metropolitan reading test. Students attend Title I classes one period a day five days a week in addition to their

regular program. Individualized instruction is delivered by a Title I teacher to a maximum group size of eight students at the elementary level, nine at the middle school level and ten students at the secondary level. A paraprofessional assists in the instructional process.

Faced with budget cutbacks this year, several staffing changes have taken place. At the administrative level, seven positions were eliminated; three of these in the area of staff development. At the school level, the number of paraprofessionals has been reduced, with several paraprofessionals dividing their time among two or more schools, Clerical aides have been eliminated altogether.

In addition to the staffing changes, the Title I math program and the Early Childhood Programs have been eliminated entirely.

As will be seen in the program description for each of the school levels, the measures of student success in the program are stated in terms of a one normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain on appropriate achievement tests and accomplishment of 85% of the objectives outlined for the student's instructional level. A one NCE gain means that the student has gained in comparison to the average of the national student norming groups.

III. EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation of the FY 82 Title I Elementary Reading and Secondary Reading/Language Programs is designed to provide formative and summative information to staff, headmasters and administrators. Summative information, including standardized test findings and attendance information will be provided in the final report after students are post-tested on the Metropolitan Achievement Test in reading and the California Achievement Test in Language Arts. This interim report focuses on formative findings.

The following issues were developed following initial meetings with Title I administrators. In anticipation of further budget cuts and program changes being considered for next year, the following issues were developed. This evaluation attempts to address the following major concerns of the Title I administrative staff.

Evaluation Questions

Program Strengths and Weaknesses

1. What are the major strengths of the present Title I program?
2. What changes would staff like to see implemented in the future Title I programs?

Effects of Title I Cutbacks

1. When did the Title I program get fully implemented in each school?
2. Has the reduction in the number of Title I paraprofessionals affected the Title I program?
3. How are the paraprofessionals involved in the program?
4. Has the elimination of clerical aides affected the Title I program?
5. Who has assumed the clerical tasks formerly carried out by the clerical aides?
6. How would staff rate the morale of Title I staff?

Policy Issues

1. Should the "pull-out model" where children are removed from their regular classroom activities for Title I, continue to be used as the major way of delivering Title I services?

2. If the "pull-out Model" were to be discontinued as the major way of delivering Title I services, what alternative would staff like to see implemented?

3. Do staff at the elementary level think Title I children should be using the same basal reading series in Title I and their regular classroom?

4. Are Title I teachers working toward reading certification?

Staff Development Concerns

1. What would Title I teachers like to see offered in the area of staff development?

Parent Involvement

1. Is parent involvement important to Title I?

Questionnaires addressing these issues were developed for Title I teachers and paraprofessionals, the building administrators, secondary level Title I students and for non-Title I teachers. These evaluation questions were also used to focus the informal interviews.

Specific activities and data sources included interviews, questionnaires and classroom visits. Findings from these activities are presented in this report.

Schools Evaluated

The Boston Public Schools administration decided that this evaluation would focus only on schools in Districts II, III, VI. In addition, a gifted and talented program at the Holland School in District V is being evaluated. Program Objectives for each school level are stated in the following sections.

Table 1

Enrollment of Title I Students

In Districts II, III, and VI

By Type of School

Elementary Schools	Public	Private	Totals
District			
II	765	89	954
III	554	48	602
VI	897	544	1,441
Total Elementary for three Districts	2,216	781	2,997
Middle Schools	**Public**	**Private**	**Totals**
District			
II	405	43	448
III	90	75	165
VI	455	105	560
Total Middle School for three Districts	950	223	1,173
High Schools	**Public**	**Private**	**Totals**
District			
II	178	0	178
III	0	0	0
VI	61	47	108
Total High School for three Districts	239	47	286
Total for Three Districts	3,405	1,051	4,456

A. Interviews

The following table reviews interviews and data sources for elementary, middle and high school programs.

Table 2

Interview Data Sources

Interview	N	Data Source
Individual	1	Associate Director, Research and Evaluation
	1	Associate Director, Title I
	1	Evaluation Specialist
Group	8	Title I Director, Associate Director, & Assistant Directors
	2	Staff development personnel
Informal	36	Title I teachers
	12	Paraprofessionals
	13	Headmasters/Principals

In addition, the evaluation team attended eight in-service workshops for Title I staff and a Boston PAC meeting.

B. Questionnaires

In mid-January questionnaires were mailed to all Title I teachers in districts II, III and VI. In addition we mailed questionnaires to principals/headmasters, paraprofessionals, non-Title I teachers and a sampling of Title I high school students in the same districts. Follow up reminders to complete the questionnaires occured during subsequent on-site visits.

To determine the number of non-Title I teacher questionnaires to send to each building, we doubled the number of Title I teachers. The Title I coordinator selected the non-Title I teachers to be given questionnaires.

The following tables indicate questionnaire response rates for involved personnel and students at the elementary, middle and high school levels.

Table 3

Response Rate of Questionnaires

Elementary Schools

Data Source	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Principal/Headmaster	37	27	73%
Title I Teacher	74	50	68%
Paraprofessionals	45	29	64%
Non-Title I Teachers	148	73	49%
TOTAL	304	179	59%

Table 4

Response Rate of Questionnaires

Middle Schools

Data Source	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Principal/Headmaster	13	6	46%
Title I Teacher	25	18	72%
Paraprofessionals	14	9	64%
Non-Title I Teachers	50	17	34%
TOTAL	102	50	49%

Table 5

Response Rate of Questionnaires

High Schools

Data Source	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Principal/Headmaster	3	1	33%
Title I Teacher	7	6	86%
Paraprofessionals	5	1	20%
Non-Title I Teachers	14	5	35%
Students	36	30	83%
TOTAL	65	43	66%

The response rate from Title I teachers at all levels was excellent. The response rate from principals and headmasters was excellent at the elementary level. The response rate from non-Title I teachers at the secondary level was lower than at the elementary level.

Some conjectures as to why the response rate was somewhat lower at the secondary level is that the elementary schools tend to be smaller, and the Title I program is likely to be better known. Also at the elementary level the teachers see the students all day long and may have a greater appreciation of improvements in reading skills attained by the Title I program.

C. Observations

On-site observations were conducted in 20 elementary schools, four middle schools and four high schools. The tables below indicate the number of these observations by type of school.

Table 6

On-Site Observations - Elementary Schools

	Public Schools		Parochial Schools	
	Total Number	Total Visited	Total Number	Total Visited
Schools	25	16	12	4
Teachers	53	30*	17 1/2	7
Paras	44	15*	10 1/2	7

* Note - On one occasion two classes were observed taught by the same teacher/paraprofessional team.

Table 7

On-Site Observations - Middle Schools

	Public Schools		Parochial Schools	
	Total Number	Total Visited	Total Number	Total Visited
Schools	7	3*	6	1
Teachers	19	5	6	1
Paras	9	4	6	1

* Note - In two schools classes were observed, in a third school there were principal and teacher interviews only.

Table 8

On-Site Observations - High Schools

	Public Schools		Parochial Schools	
	Total Number	Total Visited	Total Number	Total Visited
Schools	2	2	1	1
Teachers	8	5	1	1
Paras	6	5	1	1

Summary of Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for this formative report has focussed on the on-going operation of the Boston Title I program this year and on certain policy relevant issues. Three districts (II, III, and VI) were selected by the Boston Public Schools administration as a focus for the evaluation efforts this year. The evaluation team first interviewed Title I administrators and from those interviews developed a set of evaluation questions. Instruments were devised to measure staff perceptions of these policy relevant issues. At the elementary level 304 questionnaires were mailed, 179 (59%) were returned. At the middle school level 102 were sent out and 50 (49%) returned, while at the high school 65 were mailed, 43 returned (66%). All Title I teachers and paraprofessionals were questionnaired as were all building administrators with Title I programs in the three target districts. The Title I evaluation coordinator in each school was instructed to select non-Title I teachers to fill out questionnaires. Twice as many non-Title I teachers as Title I teachers in each school were selected.

In addition a total of 37 elementary school, six middle school, and six high school Title I classes have been observed.

IV. ELEMENTARY PROGRAM

A. Program Description

Approximately 3,000 elementary students in Districts II, III, and VI are enrolled in Title I reading programs this year. Students who score below the fortieth percentile on the Metropolitan Reading test are eligible for Title I instruction. Upon entering the program students are given the Sucher-Allred test to determine placement in an appropriate reading level.

For one period a day five days a week, Title I students receive supplemental reading instruction from a Title I teacher who is assisted by a full-time or part-time paraprofessional. Title I classes are purposely small with a maximum of eight students per teacher.

Instructional plans are individualized, but students often work together in small groups. Each student has an individual folder in which is kept a weekly lesson plan, a reading workbook, worksheets and other materials. Upon arriving in class students are expected to pick up their folders, read their daily plan and begin working. During the class the teacher both assists students individually and gives individual or small group instruction.

During the year students are expected to raise their reading scores and achieve a certain number of reading objectives. The overall measure of success is stated in the objectives below:

Given approximately 45 minutes of instruction 5 days per week for the school year with no more than 11% absenteeism,

- Title I students will successfully accomplish 85% of the objectives outlined for her/his instructional level.
- Title I students will show an increase of one normal curve equivalent score as measured by the appropriate levels of the Metropolitan Achievement Reading Survey Test.
- Title I students will show an increase of one normal curve equivalent score as measured by the appropriate level of the California Achievement Test, 1977-1978 Edition.
- Title I students will show an increase of one normal curve equivalent report which will be submitted after the end of the school year. As previously stated, this report focuses on the process of the program to date.

1. Date of Program Implementation

Eighty percent of the Title I teachers surveyed reported that their Title I classes were fully underway by late September. However, a few programs did not get underway until October. The implementation schedule is shown in the following table.

Table 9

Implementation Dates of Elementary Title I Programs

N of Teachers	Percent	Date
40	80%	Late September
8	16%	Early October
2	4%	Middle October
Totals 50	100%	

2. Classroom Observations

Between late December and early February the evaluation team visited forty-one Title I classes in twenty-four different public and parochial schools.

Facilities

The types of facilities in use for Title I class sessions are categorized below.

Table 10

Types of Title I Classroom Facilities

Type of Facility	N	Percent
Regular classroom	18	45%
Open classroom	2	5%
Shared classroom	11	28%
Small classroom	7	18%
NCEC Lab	1	3%
Large Auditorium (divided)	1	3%
Total number of classrooms visited	40*	102%

* Note - In one school the evaluator observed two classes taught by the same teacher, thus there are 41 classes observed but only 40 classrooms.

Thirty eight out of forty of the classrooms were deemed satisfactory by the evaluators. However, in one school the shared room seemed too small for the two teachers, two paraprofessionals and fourteen students occupying it. The teachers confirmed this observation. In another school, the teacher felt her small room was adequate, but added that it was difficult to set up listening stations or small instruction groups within such a small area. In a third school the Title I classroom was in the basement next to the boiler. Although the evaluator found the furnace noise distracting, the teachers said they had become oblivious to it. The observed students were attentive to the class discussion, and did not seem bothered by the noise.

Curriculum Materials

The evaluators observed an abundance of curriculum materials in use in all classrooms. These materials included textbooks, workbooks, learning kits, and mimeographed worksheets.

The most frequently observed basal reading series was the Ginn 720. In two classrooms the Rand McNally series was being used. In three classrooms the Laidlaw series was being pilot tested.

Other instructional materials in use included the Cambridge Reading Word-A-Text, the Richard Boning series, Readers Workshop materials, tyco puzzles, word cards, dictionaries, worksheets, reading games, and teacher made instructional materials. Observed audio-visual equipment in operation included tape recorders, record players, slide projectors, overhead projectors, and controlled readers.

All students had an individual work folder in which were kept a work plan, workbook, often a notebook and worksheets.

When asked if the curriculum materials were satisfactory, teachers repeatedly responded positively. However, in three schools we heard the following requests:

- (school administrator) "I would like to acquire listening stations for Title I use. Otherwise I'm satisfied.
- (Title I teacher) "I wish we had more library materials to reinforce the Title I reading program. Students have little opportunity to use the library and there is a scarcity of books at their level".
- (Title I teacher) "I wish I had more opportunity to choose my own curriculum materials."

One principal said that at the beginning of the year there had been a lack of duplicating fluid and crayons in his school. The parents had raised money for these essentials. Shortage of supplies in a school also affects the Title I program.

Instructional Activities Observed

In an attempt to minimize class disruption, the evaluator attempted to stay in each classroom for a full class period. However, on one occasion in a shared classroom the evaluator spent thirty minutes on each side. On another occasion, since the observation took place during the last period of the day, the evaluator spent fifteen minutes in each of two classrooms. During the observational period classroom activities were recorded on a checklist. Multiple teaching techniques were often observed within this time frame. Whenever possible, the teacher was briefly interviewed. Often this took place at the end of a class period or during a free period. The table below shows the number of classes in which each general type of teaching technique was used.

Table 11

Frequency of Observed Teaching Techniques

N = 41 Observations

	N	Percent
Staff assists student individually	34	83%
Small group instruction (2-4 students)	28	68%
Whole class instruction	33	80%
Students work independently	29	71%

The most common instructional activities observed were staff assisting students individually and whole class instruction. Somewhat less common, but still observed in about seven out of ten classrooms were small group instruction of two to four students and having students work independently. Since these four activities all were quite common, it is clear that during a typical period the average classroom would use three of the four instructional techniques.

Paraprofessional Involvement

In the majority of classes the paraprofessional was actively involved in reinforcing classroom instruction. In several instances upon entering the classroom it was difficult for the evaluator to differentiate between teacher and paraprofessional because both were doing similar activities.

On only two occasions the evaluator was unable to determine the paraprofessional role in the classroom. On both occasions the paraprofessional was sitting at a table or desk observing the class, rather than playing a more active role in the classroom.

As the number of paraprofessionals has been reduced this year, we did not always observe a paraprofessional during our visits. Out of a total of forty one observations, a paraprofessional was assisting in twenty-five classes.

Observed activities undertaken by the paraprofessional included escorting pupils to and from class, taking attendance, distributing and collecting materials, reading to small groups, directing a discussion about the story, and assisting individuals or small groups with their assignments. In the NCEC lab the paraprofessionals assisted students in finding the appropriate lesson cassette tapes, helped with machine malfunctions, graded worksheets and tests, and answered students questions.

Table 12 shows the number of times each of these activities were observed. In many instances the paraprofessional was involved in several activities during the same class period.

Table 12

Role of the Paraprofessionals

N = 25 Observations

	N	Percent
Escorting pupils to and from class	24	96%
Working with individuals or small groups for reinforcement	23	92%
Leading discussion groups about story/listening to students read	18	72%
Correcting worksheets/workbooks	16	64%
Taking attendance/record keeping	13	52%
Distributing and collecting materials	12	48%
Reading to small groups	5	20%
Playing instructional games	4	16%
Operating audio-visual equipment	3	12%

* Note - In five of our visits the paraprofessional was supposed to be present, but was absent. Thus of 30 classes which should have had paraprofessionals, there was an absenteeism rate of 5/30 or 17%.

It was apparent during our visits that a major portion of the paraprofessional time was spent in the delivery of student services. The paraprofessional spent much of the class time assisting individuals or working with small groups for reinforcement. The performance of clerical tasks seemed to be a minor role. In terms of the activities on our checklist, the average paraprofessional did four or five of the activities listed during the class observed.

Student Activities

In each of the classrooms observed a variety of activities and interactions occurred. Although the dynamics and climate of the classroom cannot be reproduced here, we have recorded the specific types of student activities observed.

Table 13

Student Activities Observed

N = 41 Classes Observed

	N	Percent
Oral reading	28	68%
Conferring/teacher	28	68%
Using worksheets	26	63%
Using workbooks	24	59%
Silent reading	22	54%
Conferring/paraprofessional	14	34%
Watch teacher at blackboard	13	32%
Listening skills	12	29%
Pronunciation drills	9	22%
Oral language exercises	9	22%
Listening to teacher read	8	20%
Playing instructional games	8	20%
Vocabulary lesson	8	20%
Dictionary usage	5	12%
Working at blackboard	4	10%

Specific student activities were also recorded in terms of the number of classes in which they were observed. Table 13 shows the number of classrooms in which each of these activities were observed.

The most frequently observed activities were oral reading, conferring with the teacher, using worksheets and workbooks, and silent reading. Supplementary activities such as oral drills and exercises, instructional games, dictionary and blackboard work, were not observed as often.

Summary of Elementary Program Description

More than 80 percent of the elementary school teachers reported that their Title I programs began in late September, only four percent had not begun their programs until early October. About half (45%) of the Title I classes were held in regular classrooms, one-forth in shared classrooms, and one-fifth in small classrooms. Only about six percent of the instructional spaces were judged to be inadequate.

There was an abundance of curriculum materials available and in use. In only three schools (8%) were there relatively mild concerns about materials.

In the classes observed three or four different types of instructional activities were involved, with the most common being assisting students individually and whole class instruction. The paraprofessionals performed a variety of activities including in almost all cases escorting students to and from class (96%) and working with students for reinforcement (92%). Other paraprofessional activities included leading discussion groups (72%), correcting worksheets (64%), and taking attendance and record keeping (52%).

The most common student activities were oral reading (68%), conferring with teacher (68%), using worksheets (63%) and workbooks (59%), and silent reading (54%).

B. Perceived Strengths of the Current Elementary School TITLE I Program

In the elementary schools being evaluated Title I teachers and paraprofessionals, administrators, and non-Title I teachers were all sent questionnaires which asked their opinions about program strengths, cutbacks, and policy issues.

The table showing the rate of response to these questionnaires is being repeated here to assure that the reader is aware of the quantity of responses on which this report is based.

Table 14*

Elementary Schools

Response Rate of Questionnaires

Data Source	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Principal/Headmaster	37	27	73%
Title I Teacher	74	50	68%
Paraprofessionals	45	29	64%
Non-Title I Teachers	148	73	49%
TOTAL	304	179	59%

* This table is also Table 3 in the evaluation design section, page 8.

As can be noted, a substantial majority of Administrators, Title I teachers and paraprofessionals, as well as almost half of the non-Title I teachers, responded to VNA questionnaires.

The program strengths most frequently mentioned by all groups of participants were:

- o INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION
- o SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION *

* Some respondents mentioned both "individualized" instruction and "small group" instruction. Others talked about "individualized, small group" instruction as if it were one item (although we counted it as two), and they went on to name another strength. Among all groups, however, more respondents praised the individualized approach, rather than small groups per se.

As Table 15 (next page) shows, the two other strengths mentioned by members of all the respondent groups were:

- o IMPROVEMENT IN STUDENTS' SKILLS
- o IMPROVEMENT IN STUDENTS' SELF-IMAGE

It is interesting to note that far more respondents perceived the strengths of the program in terms of instructional aspects rather than in terms of student gains. It is not clear whether this reflects mid-year professional concern with process rather than results or whether it is hard to see day-to-day improvement in students as opposed to end-of-year gains confirmed by test results. Respondents may have also been motivated by a need to protect essential program elements in an era of continuing Title I cutbacks. Nonetheless, only two of the mentioned Title I strengths directly specify effects on students. All the others deal with the process of the program.

Table 15

"What are the Two Major Strengths of the Title I Program?"

Elementary School Staff Responses

RESPONSES	Title I Teachers N = 50	Para-profs N = 29	School Admin. N = 27	Non-Title I Teachers N = 73
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
1. Individualized Instruction	64%	34%	37%	53%
2. Small Group Instruction	36%	30%	30%	34%
3. Improvement in Student Skills	12%	14%	15%	8%
4. Improvement in Student Self Image	12%	14%	11%	7%
5. Materials	10%	-	7%	8%
6. Assistance of Paraprofessionals	10%	-	-	-
7. Diagnostic and Assessment Capabilities of Program	8%	-	-	5%
8. Competency of Title I Teachers	-	14%	22%	5%
9. Supplemental Training in Reading	-	7%	-	26%
10. Well-trained Paraprofessionals	-	-	7%	-

Materials were mentioned as a strength by 7%-10% of all the professional educators, but not by paraprofessionals.

Competency of Title I teachers was mentioned as a strength by an impressive 22% of school administrators, but only 14% of the paraprofessinals and 5% of the Non-Title I teachers.

Administrators (7%) mentioned that paraprofessionals were "well trained", whereas Title I teachers were more concerned about the "assistance" of paraprofessionals.

More than a quarter of the non-Title I teachers praised the program for offering "supplemental" training in reading suggesting that their students indeed need this additional instructional aid.

Other strengths mentioned by individual paraprofessionals were "fewer distractions in the Title I rooms", "teacher and paraprofessional work together", and "workshops".

All elementary staff returning questionnaires gave at least one answer when asked about program strengths, and not one of them gave a negative response.

The widespread support of Title I at the elementary school level was perhaps most poignantly summed up by an elementary school principal who said:

> "Because of 2 1/2 remedial reading teachers were cut. We've got to keep Title I. That's all I've got."

Summary of Perceived Strengths

The major perceived strengths of the Title I elementary level program were its individualized instruction and its small group instruction. Also quite important were the improvement in student's skills and the improvement in student's self-image. Administrators were also likely to note the competency of Title I teachers as a strength, while the non-Title I teachers noted the supplementary training in reading as a strength of the program.

C. Perceived Effects of FY1982 Cutbacks in Programs

The Boston Title I program was forced to cut back in FY1982 in response to a reduction in federal funding. As noted in the introduction to this report, some programs (such as Early Childhood) were completely eliminated. In the middle, and high school programs, as many teacher positions as possible were preserved, but the numbers of paraprofessional and staff development positions were reduced, and all clerical aide positions were eliminated.

The Boston Title I Evaluation office asked us to determine the perceived effects of these cutbacks. This chapter describes the perceptions registered on questionnaires returned by Title I staff and school principals/headmasters. In some instances comments from interviews are also included.

1. Perceived Effects of Reduction of Paraprofessionals

Whereas previously each Title I teacher was assisted by a full-time paraprofessional, this year because of budget cuts the number of paraprofessionals has been reduced. With a few exceptions, schools with the highest percentages of low income children have full-time paraprofessionals and schools with fewer low income children have part-time paraprofessionals. In the three districts being evaluated, of those classes observed, twenty out of twenty-four Title I teachers are sharing paraprofessionals. Table 16 shows the numbers of teachers and paraprofessionals instructing in Districts II, III, or VI.

Table 16

Number of Teachers and Paraprofessionals in Districts II, III, and VI.

Elementary

	PUBLIC		PRIVATE	
DISTRICTS	Para's	T. I Teachers	Para's	T. I Teachers
II	17 1/2	20	2	4
III	7 1/2	13	1/2	1
VI	19	20	8	12 1/2

We asked principals, Title I teacher and paraprofessionals how the reductions of paraprofessionals has affected the Title I program. Their responses are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

"Has the reduction of paraprofessionals affected your Title I Program this year?"

Elementary

	N	Not at all	Somewhat	Seriously	No Response
Principals/Headmasters	27	37%	52%	7%	4%
Title I Teachers	50	50%	22%	18%	10%
Paraprofessionals	29	7%	28%	62%	3%

As shown in Table 17 more paraprofessionals thought the Title I Program was seriously affected by the reduction of paraprofessionals than did Title I teachers or school administrators. Principals were the second largest group to complain. Many Title I teachers who responded that the program was not at all affected had a full-time paraprofessional and did not personally feel the impact of the cutback.

Paraprofessional Comments

Paraprofessionals cite reduced individual attention, disruption in continuity, and an increased amount of paperwork for teachers among the drawbacks resulting from the reduction of paraprofessionals.

- "The children are affected because they cannot receive the individual attention they need."
- "A paras efforts are spread too thin when assigned to two teachers. Children are deprived of constant help and feel a loss when you go to your other school."
- "Without the help of paraprofessionals teachers are unable to teach because of the paper work involved."

Title I Teacher Comments

Title I teachers currently assisted by a part-time paraprofessional said the following:

- "The paraprofessional was my right arm. My "arm" is missing!"
- "Services to children are affected due to lack of paraprofessional-difficulty in meeting diversification of student's individual needs."
- "Splitting an aide has not worked out well. They are an integral part of the program."

School Administrators Comments

School administrators affected by a reduction of paraprofessionals in their schools said the following:

- "There is less opportunity for reinforced drill and instruction."
- "Less time for individual work with students."
- "Our student needs indicate that an aide in these (Title I) classes would definitely improve progress."

2. Perceived Effects of Elimination of CLERICAL AIDE positions

When asked the degrees to which their Title I programs were affected by cuts in clerical aide positions this year, elementary school principals and Title I teachers responded roughly in the same proportions. As Table 18 below shows, over 40 percent of each group said their programs were only "somewhat" affected, and approximately one-third of each group said they were "not at all" affected. Nonetheless, 22 percent of the principals and 18 percent of the teachers said their programs were "seriously" affected.

Asked to note whom had assumed responsibility for clerical tasks, most respondents indicated that the work was shared. The teachers were most frequently involved, followed by school secretaries, then paraprofessionals, then principals.

Table 18

"Has the elimination of CLERICAL AIDES affected your Title I Program this year?"

Responses of Elementary School Staff

	N	Not at all	Somewhat	Seriously	No Response
Principals	27	33%	41%	22%	4%
Title I Teachers	50	34%	44%	18%	4%

Some Comments on the Loss of Clerical Aides

"I have to take care of teacher and aide attendance, payroll, etc." (Principal)

"A burden on people who are already too busy. There is no way I can add the Title I clerical duties to my office 'load'." (Principal)

"Time has to be spent aquiring forms formerly provided by the clerical aide." (Teacher)

"The service we received was minimal; there wasn't any slack to assume." (Principal)

"I never saw the clerical aide." (Teacher)

In addition, four of the teachers noted that they were new to the program and never had clerical aides before.

3. Perceptions of Staff Morale

In spite of Title I cutbacks this year and layoffs in other school programs, a surprisingly strong majority of staff rate the morale as high among Title I personnel. As shown in Table 19, while a total of 62 percent of Title I teachers rated morale high in their schools, a somwhat lower percent of school administrators rated morale as high (55%).

One teacher cited a "very dedicated competent staff" as a reason for very high teacher morale. An "extremely enthusiastic" and "excellent staff" were also mentioned.

Two school administrators commended their Title I staff. One indicated that the Title I teachers also impact on other students in the building.

"Good morale has resulted in effective instruction."

"Our people are great, this carries over to their relationship with other students."

Table 19

"How would you rate the MORALE of the Title I staff in your school?"

	N	Very High	High	Average	Low	Very Low
Principal	27	33%	22%	33%	11%	0%
Title I Teachers	50	46%	16%	18%	10%	10%

In spite of the relatively high assessment of morale, however, it should be noted that 11 percent of the school administrators and 10 percent of the Title I teachers said that morale was low. Among the reasons given are job uncertainty and loss of staff development personnel. The new requirement for reading certification was also mentioned. Typical teacher complaints about low morale were as follows:

Title I Teacher's Comments on Morale

"I feel the morale in the B.P.S. is generally very low with layoffs, threatened layoffs, threatened federal cutbacks. The loss of Title I staff development seriously affected staff morale. They were important to us."

"No one knows what cuts they're going to make next year and it's very depressing."

"Pressure has an adverse affect on the outlook of personnel who are qualified, yet are victims of a system which says if you received a certificate before 1956 you are qualified. This is an arbitrary choice and is purely irrational."

During an observational visit we were told that a paraprofessional is unhappy in one of her (shared) schools. While walking to school from public transportation she has been harassed by teenagers several times. (She is black, and the neighborhood is white). She is unhappy in her situation and would like to move to another school.

In summary, although two-thirds of Title I teachers responded that morale was high, a number of teachers find it difficult to work in uncertain situations. The new requirement for Reading Certification has some teachers concerned. Teachers are continually reminded of their tenuous circumstances.

Summary of Perceived Effects of Cuts

The loss of the paraprofessionals has not been too severe so far, and while the paraprofessionals themselves see a serious effect (62%) few Title I teachers (18%) or principals (7%) see the loss as serious. The complete elimination of clerical aides is seen as a serious loss by 22% of the principals and by 18% of the teachers, but one third of both groups were not at all affected by their loss. Morale among the Title I staff is perceived as very high or high by 55 percent of the principals and by 62 percent of the Title I teachers.

D. Policy Issues

This section of the Elementary School Evaluation focuses on respondents views of certain policy issues regarding the future of Title I Programs. At the elementary school level, these issues are:

- Should the PULL-OUT MODEL for Title I be continued or should an alternative model be adopted? If an alternative model is chosen, which one?
- What should be done in terms of STAFF DEVELOPMENT for Title I?
- How important is PARENT INVOLVEMENT for Title I?
- Should Title I use the same BASAL READERS as the regular teachers?

1. Pull-Out Model

What program model should be used for Title I: PULL-OUT or an ALTERNATIVE?

Title I teachers, school administrators and non-Title I teachers were all asked in the questionnaires whether "The pull-out model should continue to be used as the major way of delivering Title I services?" Respondents were asked to check "No," "Unsure," "Yes, but with major changes," "Yes, with minor changes," or "Yes, with no change." They were also asked to submit a comment if they wished.

As Table 20 below shows respondents in all job classifications most frequently indicated that they wanted to retain the pull-out model with no changes. Another sizeable group (41% of administrators and roughly 22% of all others) wanted only minor changes. There were only scattered responses to other answer choices.

Table 20

Should Pull-Out be the Major Program Model for Title I?

Responses of Elementary School Personnel

	N	No	Unsure	Yes, with major changes	Yes, with minor changes	Yes, with no changes	No Response
Administrators	27	7%	4%	-	41%	52%	-
T. I Teachers	50	-	-	-	22%	76%	2%
Non-T.I Teach.	73	4%	-	7%	22%	67%	-
Paras	29	-	3%	-	21%	76%	-

It therefore appears that present elementary school staff would like to keep the Title I program model much as it is now. Administrators were somewhat more willing than teachers or paraprofessionals to suggest that minor changes were needed.

Most of the changes that were suggested concerned scheduling, grouping of students, and selection of students rather than a different model. Typical comments included the following:

Title I Teacher Comments

"The classroom teacher should have the power to have the child serviced."

"A little more flexibility in grouping."

"Decrease in hours for some students either in time per day or in number of days per week."

"If organized and scheduled with the cooperation of homeroom teachers, pull-out is the most effective."

"If pull-out were discontinued, I would withdraw from the program."

"Less rigidity in number of pupils/period"

"If the regular classroom teacher could choose who came to Title I and at what time the flaws in the program would be eliminated."

Paraprofessionals Comments

"Our schedule works perfectly at the convenience of Title I and Classroom teachers."

"Changes, meaning going back to full-time para."

Non-Title I Teacher Comments

"Children should be pulled from the same classroom at the same time for services (all kinds) - it is less disruptive."

"Title I children should be pulled out during enrichment times at classroom teachers' convenience."

"More time needed for communication between classroom teachers and Title I to better assist students."

"A program that has been successful should not be changed. The results should speak for the program."

The major type of complaint about the pull-out model came from those classroom teachers who said the program was "disruptive" and that "it is too difficult for children to make up work they miss" in the regular classroom.

Respondents were then asked, "If an alternative to the pull-out model were to be used in your school, what alternative would you suggest?" A checkoff list of five items was given with the opportunity to comment.

When pressed in this way to select an alternative, 40 percent of Title I teachers still said they preferred the pullout model and another 26 percent said, "Title I teacher working with the regular classroom teacher in the classroom." Either of these methods would preserve the role of the Title I teacher.

Classroom teachers and school administrators also selected the use of Title I teachers in the regular classrooms as the best alternative to the pull-out model.

The most frequent alternative to pull-out suggested by paraprofessionals was the use of Title I paraprofessionals in the regular classroom.

Of the other alternatives presented as choices - NCEC, after school Title I, and Summer School Title I - none were selected by more than 14 percent of any respondent group.

The only additional model suggested was a non-Title I teacher's mention of a "before school Title I program".

Table 21

Responses of Elementary Staffs to Alternatives to the Pull-Out Model

Alternative	School Administrator (N = 27)	Title I Teacher (N = 50)	Para (N = 29)	Non-Title I Teacher (N = 73)
Title I teacher working with the regular classroom teacher in the same classroom.	26%	26%	3%	29%
Title I paraprofessional working with regular teacher in the same classroom.	7%	-	24%	12%
New Century Reading Lab (NCEC)	11%	14%	10%	8%
After school Title I program	11%	2%	-	5%
Summer school Title I program	4%	6%	3%	5%
Pull-out preferred	11%	40%	31%	22%
No Response	11%	8%	10%	8%
Other, unsure, or combination	-	4%	3%	8%

2. Staff Development

Due to budget cuts three staff development positions have been eliminated this year. Remaining are two staff development personnel, one of whom supervises elementary teachers while the other supervises secondary teachers. These two people spend the major portion of their time in schools assisting Title I teachers and paraprofessionals.

When teachers were asked what they would like to see offered in the area of staff development to help them function more effectively as a Title I teacher the following requests were made:

- More concrete suggestions on how to more effectively reach uninterested students.
- Management skills (not discipline) - - - help find the time to balance vocabulary development, study skills, comprehension, oral reading (on time allotted) . . . plus testing.
- Time to content plan with classroom and support services teachers.
- Materials for the bilingual child, who's fairly fluent in English - in areas of vocabulary development.
- Staff development should set up more instructional seminars, where we could all share old and new ideas.

3. Parental Involvement

Because of a change in federal regulations, the requirements for Parent Advisory Councils at each school will be more flexible. We asked headmasters if they thought parent involvement in Title I is important. Their responses are presented in Table 22.

Table 22

"Do you think that parent involvement in Title I is important?"

N = 27 Elementary School Administrators

No	Unsure	Yes	No Response
15%	11%	56%	11%

As can be seen above, more than half of the school administrators said that parent involvement is important. When asked for suggestions for methods of obtaining parent participation in the event that advisory councils were eliminated, seven administrators said open houses could be a possible alternative and another seven said the Home and School Association could encourage parent participation. Additional suggestions included having individual conferences and inviting parents to come to school once a month to pick up report cards.

One administrator who feels that parent involvement is not important to Title I wrote:

> "Almost all of our parents are working. Attempts to have them here for a Title I meeting during the day are fruitless. In order to save money, I would recommend cutting the job of the person who does the meeting with parents, as I see it as useless."

A Title I central administrator, however, noted that parent involvement, at least at the city-wide level must be encouraged, and the group must be consulted. He felt that a strong city-wide parent council is an important constituency to support Title I politically. At a nationwide meeting he had attended active parents were given credit for applying enough political pressure to keep Title I out of the block grants.

block grants.

4. Basal Readers

Should elementary school children use the same Basal Reader in Title I as in the regular classroom?

Ninety-two percent of the Title I teachers and 67 percent of the non-Title I teachers say the same basal reader should NOT be used for both Title I and the regular classroom. The reasons given were that use of the same book in both situations would be boring and confusing. Teachers claimed that youngsters need variety and supplementary reading.

Table 23

Do you think that Title I children should be using the same basal reading series in Title I as in their regular classroom?

	N	No	Unsure	Yes
Title I teachers	50	92%	4%	4%
Non-Title I Teachers	73	67%	5%	27%

One teacher explained that through the use of the same book

> "You could reinforce directly what is going on in the classroom, but they might get bored."

Another teacher noted that:

> "If the children could use the same basal reading series they would not not need Title I."

and, the same basal could be used only

> "If vocabulary in the classroom basal were adjusted to high, low and average levels."

Twenty seven percent of the non-Title I teachers, however, did support the use of the same basal. There were no comments to explain the reasoning for this position, though one teacher claimed:

> "In order for Title I to be more effective it is absolutely neccessary."

Summary of Policy Issues

The Pull-Out model is overwhelmingly supported by all four groups surveyed. Some 76 percent of elementary school Title I teachers wanted it retained without changes and an additional 22 percent were in favor of only minor changes. Paraprofessionals were just as high in support and non-Title I teachers were also strongly in favor of the pull-out model. Only 4 percent of the non-Title I teachers and 7 percent of the administrators were opposed to the pull-out model. Most suggested changes related to scheduling.

When forced to consider alternatives to the pull-out model, about one fourth of the administrators, Title I teachers, and non-Title I teachers favored having a Title I teacher work with a regular teacher. This alternative was rejected by the paraprofessionals in favor of a model with the Title I paraprofessionals working with regular teachers (24%). Only scattered preferences for the other alternatives were given. Strong arguments against the after school and summer school Title I programs were given, noting that bus schedules would make these very difficult and expensive.

Staff development needs related to help with reaching unmotivated students, developing classroom management skills, materials for bilingual children, and the need to share ideas.

More than half (56%) of the administrators felt that parental involvement in Title I was important, but 15 percent felt it was not. Suggestions for the use of open houses, use of the Home and School Association, and individual conferences were made. The political value of city-wide parental advisory group was noted by a Title I administrator.

In general the use of different basal readers in Title I from those used in regular classes was supported. Some 92 percent of the Title I teachers and 67 percent of the non-Title I teachers favored use of different basal readers.

E. Suggested Changes

Each respondent was invited to suggest changes in the Title I program, in addition to comments on the specific program elements already discussed. Between one-fifth and one-third of the four groups specifically commented that the program should not be changed. Others just left this question blank.

Table 24

Suggested Changes by Elementary School Respondents

Suggested Changes	Principals	Title I Teachers	Paras	Non-Title I Teachers
No Change	19%	24%	31%	19%
Selection of Students	26%	24%	7%	30%
Planning & Coordination	-	28%	10%	22%
Adjustment of Class Size/Time	15%	12%	14%	11%
Restore Para for each teacher	4%	8%	14%	-
Less paperwork	-	18%	3%	-
Include Math Title I	-	1%	-	7%

The Selection of Students category included suggestions to give more flexibility to selection; less emphasis on testing for selection; more imput from the Title I teacher and regular teachers; raising the percentile for eligible students and elimination of the geocodes.

Suggestions in the Planning and Coordination category included increasing the planning time of the Title I teacher and increasing the coordination between the Title I teacher and the classroom teacher.

The Adjustment of Class Size/Time suggestions usually related to decreasing class size or caseload, and increasing class time. Some of these suggestions were for more flexibility in the time and scheduling of students, in keeping with their individual needs.

V. MIDDLE SCHOOL READING/LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

A. Program Description

In districts II, III and VI approximately 1,173 students in grades six through eight (public and private) were enrolled in the Middle School Title I program. Criteria for student selection was based on results of the Metropolitan Achievement Test administered in 1981. Students scoring less than the fortieth percentile were eligible for Title I services. Because Title I does not have the resources to service all eligible children those in greatest need are selected first. A list of qualifying students in rank order, from lowest to highest, is then maintained at each school so that new children may be added to the program as others move away.

The focus of this program is to improve reading and language art skills in a highly individualized setting. Materials and techniques are geared to the instructional level of students involved.

As Title I regulations state that students cannot miss more than one class of each major subject per week, the student's schedule is rotated daily. Class size at the middle school level is a maximum of nine pupils.

During the year students are expected to raise their reading scores and achieve a certain number of reading objectives. The overall measure of success is stated in the objectives below:

> Given a forty-five minute instructional period in reading, four days a week for thirty-five weeks, the Title I students will:
>
> - show an increase of one normal curve equivalent score, as measured (from pre to past test) by the appropriate levels of the Metropolitan Achievement Reading Survey Test.
> - show an increase of one normal curve equivalent score as measured (from pre to past test) by the appropriate level of the California Achievement Test, 1977-1978 Edition.

1. Date of Program Implementation

Twelve of the seventeen middle school Title I teachers responding to our survey indicated that their Title I classes were well underway by early October. However, in five schools the program began in mid or late October. Since a sizeable number of teachers were hired in October, delays in beginning the program were probably due to lateness in hiring staff.

For seventeen middle school classes the starting dates are outlined in Table 25 below.

Table 25

Implementation Dates of Middle School Title I Programs

N of Teachers	Percent	Date
3	18%	Late September
9	53%	Early October
2	13%	Mid October
3	18%	Late October
Totals 17	102%	

The middle school programs generally started later than the elementary school programs, since some 80 percent of the elementary programs had begun by late September but only 18 percent of the middle school programs had begun by then. Thus this year middle school students probably received about two to four weeks less Title I instruction than did the elementary school students.

2. Classroom Observations

During January the evaluation team made six classroom observations in three middle schools. In a fourth middle school the evaluator interviewed the headmaster and three teachers but did not observe classroom activities. He was able to observe the classrooms used for Title I and these three rooms are included in Table 26.

Facilities

The evaluators observed the following types of classroom facilities:

Table 26

Types of Title I Middle School Facilities

Type	N	Percent
Regular classroom	4	44%
Open classroom	-	-
Shared classroom	4	44%
Small classroom	1	11%
Total number of classrooms visited	9	99%

All classroom facilities visited seemed satisfactory. However, in one shared room the noise level seemed high and students were talking a lot. The evaluator believed the noise was disruptive to students on both sides of the divider, and the teachers later confirmed that it was difficult to teach in a

shared classroom. The teachers also reported that they have to coordinate their teaching efforts in order to share one set of equipment and materials.

In two of the six classes observed the evaluator felt that it took a while for students to "settle down". In one class three students straggled in late.

During one interview the teacher reported that classroom management at the middle school level is extremely important. This teacher has hanging on the wall a chart with a list of student names. Daily the teacher places stars next to the names of those students who meet the following requirements: come into the classroom on time, work well, do not disrupt others. She finds the students responsive to this reward system. The evaluator found the classroom quiet with students working well.

One teacher reported that having a daily schedule provides structure to the week and enables her students to know exactly what is expected of them each day. The schedule follows:

Monday - Readers Workshop

Tuesday - Reading Skills

Wednesday - Language Arts Skills

Thursday - Book Reports

Friday - Correct papers and discuss mistakes in a group.
Play instructional games if time permits.

The evaluator observed on Book Report day, and found the students reading quietly for an entire class period. The teacher circulated and individually questioned two students on the books they were reading. She advised another student on a book selection.

Curriculum Materials

There seemed to be an abundance of curriculum materials in all middle school Title I classrooms observed. However, one teacher reported that in October she and another Title I teacher had moved into an empty classroom with no materials. In this school two Title I classes were added this year. Fortunately the teacher was able to find some reading materials left by last year's reading teacher. Although, the Title I teacher has since acquired an adequate supply of Title I materials, she prefers to continue using many of the orignally acquired reading materials.

The basal reading series observed in use at this level was Plus Four by Kottmeyer. Of three teachers questioned about their satisfaction with this series two responded favorably and one found that it was boring to the students and had lessons that were too long.

Additional instructional materials observed in use during classroom visits included Reading Booster Cards by Kottmeyer, Phonics Comics: Word Power by Colonet, NFL Reading Kit, Science Research Associates Learning Kit, Readers Workshop I, Getting the Main Idea by Richard Boning. In addition, students were using notebooks in one class and reading paparback books in another.

Instructional Activities Observed

As previously mentioned, the evaluation team made six classroom observations in four schools. Each class was visited for a class period. During the observational period classroom activities were recorded on a checklist. Multiple teaching activities were often observed within this time frame. Whenever possible, the teacher was briefly interviewed. The table below shows the number of classes in which each general type of teaching technique was used.

Table 27

Frequency of Observed Teaching Techniques

N = 6 Classrooms

Technique	N	Percent
Staff assists student individually	5	83%
Small group instruction	1	17%
Whole group instruction	3	50%
Students work independently	5	83%

As can be seen from Table 27, in five out of six of the classrooms observed, the students were working independently assisted by staff. In half of the classrooms, whole group instruction was observed and in one classroom, small group (2 to 4 students) instruction was observed.

Paraprofessional Involvement

During our visits we tried to get a sense of the paraprofessional's role in the classroom. In five of six classroom visits a paraprofessional was assisting. Duties included passing out papers, speaking to students who were "acting out", listening to a tape with the students, assisting students with individual assignments and correcting papers. At this level, as students usually arrived in the classroom on their own, no paraprofessionals were observed escorting students.

Table 28

Observed Paraprofessional Role

N = 5 Observations

	N	Percent
Distributed and collected materials	1	20%
Listened to tape with students	1	20%
Listened to pupils read	1	20%
Assisted individual student	1	20%
Corrected papers	1	20%
Watched students work	2	40%

During our visits the paraprofessional typically concentrated on one or two activities for the duration of the period. While in two classes the paraprofessional "watched students work" she seemed available to students if they needed assistance.

Student Activities

In each of the classrooms, the evaluator observed a variety of activities. Although the dynamics and climate of the classroom cannot be reproduced here, we have recorded the specific types of student activities observed.

Specific student activities were also recorded in terms of the number of classes in which they were observed. Table 29 shows the number of classrooms in which each of these activities were observed.

Table 29

Frequency of Specific Activites Observed

N = 6 Observations

	Times Observed	Overall Percent
Silent Reading	5	83%
Oral Reading	3	50%
Conferring/teacher	3	50%
Using reading kits	3	50%
Tape recorder activities	2	33%
Using workbooks	2	33%
Using worksheets	2	33%
Conferring/Paraprofessional	2	33%
Watching teacher at blackboard	1	18%
Writing vocabulary words	1	18%

The most frequently observed activity was silent reading followed by oral reading, conferring with the teacher and using reading kits. In two classes students spent the major portion of the period following a story in their texts while they listened to it being read on a tape recorder.

Summary Middle School Title I Program

These programs were typically started in early October, two to four weeks later than at the elementary level. Most classrooms used at the middle school level were shared or regular classrooms. All classrooms the evaluators observed were adequate. One of the six observed in session was noisy.

There seemed to be an abundance of curriculum materials in all rooms visited. The instructional activities tended to be students working independently assisted by staff, with whole group instruction occurring in about half of the classrooms.

The paraprofessionals did a variety of activities, usually only one activity per period, and 40 percent of them were watching students work. Of the student activities observed silent reading was the most common. Other activities commonly observed were oral reading, conferring with the teacher, and using reading kits.

B. Perceived Strengths Of The Current Middle School Title I Program

In the middle schools being evaluated, Title I teachers and paraprofessionals, administrators and non-Title I teachers were all sent questionnaires which asked their opinions about program strengths, cutbacks, and policy issues.

The table showing the rate of response to these questionnaires is being repeated here to assure that the reader is aware of the number of responses on which this report is based.

Table 30*

Middle Schools

Response Rate of Questionnaires

Data Source	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Principal/Headmaster	13	6	46%
Title I Teachers	25	18	72%
Paraprofessionals	14	9	64%
Non-Title I Teachers	50	17	34%
TOTAL	102	50	49%

* Note this table is also Table 4, page 8

The Title I program strength most frequently mentioned (see Table 31) and the only one mentioned by respondents in all four groups, was that the program provides individualized instruction. In addition, teacher groups praised the small group instruction format.

Table 31

"What are the Major Strengths of the Title I Program?"

Middle School Staff Responses

RESPONSES	Title I Teachers N = 18	Para-professionals N = 9	School Admin. N = 6	Non-Title I Teachers N = 17
Individualized Program	33%	44%	33%	41%
Small Group Instruction	33%	-	-	35%
Materials	33%	11%	-	-
Competency of Title I Staff	11%	-	-	6%
Program Organization and Objectives	11%	-	-	-
Improvement in Student Skills	-	-	17%	41%
Development of Self-confidence in Students	-	-	50%	-
Regularity of Instruction	6%	-	17%	12%
Selection Based on Academic Need	-	-	-	12%
Reinforcement in Reading	-	11%	33%	6%
No Response	-	22%	-	-
Negative Response	-	-	-	6%
Other (1 response each)	22%	11%	17%	-

Title I teachers, on the whole, tended to stress the process and objectives of the program. None of the Title I teachers spoke in terms of program results, possibly because they are hard to see on a day-to-day basis unconfirmed by achievement test results or possibly because Title I teachers are very concerned about saving essential program elements from cutbacks. It is therefore very interesting to note that non-Title I teachers and administrators were not only more results-oriented, but the teachers tended to value improvement in skills, while the administrators focused on development of self-confidence in students.

Two of the paraprofessionals omitted responses to this question altogether, while one non-Title I teacher said there were no strengths and one administrator gave a similar jaded response.

It is also interesting that fewer than half of the administrators and only a third of the non-Title I teachers responded to the middle-school questionnaire, although a substantial majority of Title-I teachers and paraprofessionals responded. It may be that at the secondary level, where school populations are typically larger than in elementary schools and students switch classes, administrators and classroom teachers are less involved with the Title I program.

C. Perceived Effects of FY1982 Cutbacks in Programs

The Boston Title I program was forced to cut back in FY1982 in response to a reduction in federal funding. As noted in the introduction to this report, some programs (such as Early Childhood) were completely eliminated. In the middle, and high school programs, as many teacher positions as possible were preserved, but the numbers of paraprofessional and staff development positions were reduced, and all clerical aide positions were eliminated.

The Boston Title I Evaluation office asked us to determine the perceived effects of these cutbacks. This chapter describes the perceptions registered on questionnaires returned by Title I staff and school principals/headmasters. In some instances comments from interviews are also included.

1. Perceived Effects of Reduction of Paraprofessionals

Whereas previously each Title I teacher was assisted by a full-time paraprofessional, this year because of budget cuts the number of paraprofessionals has been reduced. With a few exceptions, schools with the highest percentage of low-income children have full-time paraprofessionals and school with fewer low-income children share paraprofessionals. Table 32 shows the number of middle school teachers and paraprofessionals instructing in Districts II, III, and VI.

Table 32

Number of Teachers and Paraprofessionals

in Districts II, III, and VI.

Middle Schools

	PUBLIC		PRIVATE	
DISTRICTS	Para's	T. I Teachers	Para's	T. I Teachers
II	2	8	1	1
III	1	2	2	2
VI	6	9	3	3

In the public middle schools there are nine paraprofessionals serving 19 Title I teachers. In the parochial schools six paraprofessionals serve six Title I teachers.

We asked principals, Title I teachers and paraprofessionals how they think the reduction of paraprofessionals has affected their Title I program. Their responses are presented in Table 33.

Table 33

"Has the reduction of paraprofessionals affected your

Title I program this year?"

Middle Schools

	N	Not at all	Somewhat	Seriously	No response
Principals/Headmasters	6	66%	17%	17%	0%
Title I Teachers	18	72%	17%	11%	0%
Paraprofessionals	9	0%	33%	67%	0%

As shown in Table 33 paraprofessionals were the largest group to respond that the Title I program was seriously affected by the reduction of paraprofessionals. Two-thirds of the paraprofessionals felt that the cutback in the number of paraprofessionals has seriously affected their Title I program this year. In contrast two-thirds of the Title I teachers and school administrators felt that the decrease in paraprofessionals had not at all affected their program. It should be remembered that in many cases teachers and administrators had not, in fact, lost any paraprofessional services from their school. The paraprofessionals noted the damage to the Title I program mostly as a decrease in the amount of time spent with individual students. One paraprofessional said,

- "The extra help - individually - under teacher's directions is an extra boost for the children. The children also have more time with teachers if the aide does other work."

Some of the teachers and headmasters who responded that their Title I program had not been affected did so because there had not been a reduction in their school. Two Title I teachers who now share a paraprofessional spoke about increased record keeping responsibilities and a problem with individualizing instruction. Their comments follow:

- "Record keeping interferes with teaching duties."
- "Need an aide full-time to do an effective job individualizing instruction."

2. Perceived Effect of Elimination of Clerical Aide Positions

When asked the degree to which their Title I programs were affected by cuts in clerical aide positions this year, school principals and Title I teachers responded in roughly the same proportions. As Table 34 below shows, two-thirds or more of each group said their programs were "not at all" affected, and 17% of each group said they were only "somewhat" affected. Nonetheless, 17% of the principals and 11% of the teachers said their programs were "seriously" affected.

Table 34

"Has the elimination of clerical aides affected your Title I Program this year?"

Responses of Middle School Staff

	N	Not at all	Somewhat	Seriously
Principals/Headmasters	6	66%	17%	17%
Title I Teachers	18	72%	17%	11%

Asked to note who had assumed responsibility for clerical tasks many respondents indicated an arrangement for sharing the work. The teachers with the paraprofessionals were most frequently involved, followed by teacher or para alone, then combinations of principals, school secretary, and teachers.

The following are typical comments made by respondents:

- "Instructional aide has a greater burden." (Teacher)
- "Payroll was one less thing to think about - Now its added to administrative burden." (School Administrator)
- "Paycheck certification has been the only clerical task assumed by me." (School Administrator)
- "Payroll for paraprofessionals and teachers should be twice a month rather than four times. It would reduce our clerical work greatly." (School Administrator)

3. Perceptions of Staff Morale

In spite of Title I cutbacks this year and layoffs in other school programs, 50% of middle school administrators and 44% of middle school Title teachers rated morale high. A smaller number (33%) of both school administrators and Title I teachers said staff morale was average. The following table shows an assessment of staff morale at the middle school level.

Table 35

How would you rate the morale of the Title I staff in your school?

Middle Schools

	N	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very Low
Principals/Headmasters	6	33%	17%	33%	17%	0%
Title I Teachers	18	22%	22%	33%	17%	6%

Whereas only 17% of Title I teachers rated morale low, they were most apt to write comments. Again, low morale was frequently related to program and staffing cuts. A few comments follow:

- "Cutting of programs and personnel has somewhat lowered morale."
- "Some of the teachers are on the R.I.F. list and have made a point of doing as little as possible."

During an observational visit in January one teacher had just been notified of being on the layoff list. It seemed to the evaluator that this teacher was doing a competent job and that the students would suffer from the loss.

Another Title I teacher is a permanent substitute. Although she prefers being a Title I teacher to irregular assignments in various classrooms, she would prefer to have a permanent Title I position.

In responding to how morale has affected Title I programs, one Title I teacher said, "More energy is spent getting angry with the system than on working for the children." Though other teachers did not express themselves as bluntly, approximately 23% of the teachers evidenced low morale on the questionnaire.

In summary, the majority of school administrators and Title I rated school morale average to high. Among those who felt morale was low, job insecurity was a primary factor.

Summary of Perceived Effects of Cutbacks at Middle School Level

The reduction in paraprofessionals does not seem to have affected the Title I program much this year, at least as perceived by Title I teachers and building administrators. The paraprofesionals remaining, however were more likely to see the loss as seriously affecting the program.

The loss of the clerical aide positions seems to have had little perceived effect as far as either building administrators or Title I teachers could see. About one-fifth of each group say the loss of these aides was a serious one, but over two thirds say it did not affect the program at all.

Among those answering our questionnaires, morale was seen as high or very high by both Title I teachers (44%) and by building administrators (50%). Only one Title I teacher said that morale was very low.

D. Policy Issues at the Middle School Level

This section of the middle school Title I evaluation focuses on respondents' views of certain policy issues regarding the future of Title I programs. These issues are:

- Should PULL-OUT be continued as the major model for Title I?
- What STAFF DEVELOPMENT activities should be held?
- Is PARENT INVOLVEMENT important at this school level?

1. Pull-Out Model

What program model should be used for Title I: Pull-out or an alternative?

Staff were first asked if the pull-out model should be continued. They were given five answer choices: No; Unsure; Yes but with major changes; Yes, but with minor changes; and Yes with no changes. They were also invited to make comments.

Although elementary school respondents were very strongly in favor of continuing the pull-out model (see page 34), middle school respondents were more divided.

Table 36

Should Pull-Out be the Major Program Model for Title I?

Responses of Middle School Personnel

	N	No	Unsure	Yes, with major changes	Yes, with minor changes	Yes, with no changes	No Response
Administrators	6	33%	-	-	33%	33%	-
Title I Teach.	18	28%	-	5%	22%	39%	5%
Paras	9	11%	11%	11%	-	64%	-
Non-T.I Tchrs	17	29%	6%	12%	35%	18%	-

Approximately two-thirds of the principals, Title I teachers, and paraprofessionals wanted to retain the Title I program with no or only minor changes. But more than a quarter of all groups wanted to discontinue the pull-out model or to make major changes.

Examining Table 36 closely, it can be seen that middle school non-Title I teachers were most in favor of change or discontinuance, though a majority of them (53%) still wanted to continue the pull-out model with little or no changes.

Though 33 percent of the school administrators wanted to discontinue the pull-out model, it should be remembered that only six administrators responded. Two wanted minor changes and two wanted to discontinue the pull-out model. The two against continuance of the pull-out model said it was not appropriate for students this age to miss other classes.

The following comments were typical of middle school respondents. As can be seen, many of the comments are concerned with the issue of trying to reschedule Title I classes so that students are not pulled out of other important subjects. It also appears from one comment that with cooperation of the classroom and Title I teachers, subject matter from other classes can be reinforced, with subject vocabulary, for instance.

School Administrators' Comments

"This method is <u>not</u> suitable for the upper grades where students miss other lessons."

Title I Teachers' Comments

"More teacher cooperation would be most appreciated."

"Title I services should be provided during activity periods" (instead of during regular class periods)

"Title I should be scheduled where possible as any other course or program."

"It is a disruptive practice, pulling kids out, but typical of the real impact of federal programs."

"Take children out of reading."

"I have been in Title I for 12 years and feel that this system (pull-out) is most effective."

Paraprofessionals' Comments

"Title I should be a separate subject on the report (card) so that students will realize how important it is."

Non-Title I Teachers' Comments

"Disruptive"

"This model does nothing to help the student do well in the class he/she misses and I don't see the improvement it promises. Is the Title I curriculum irrelevant?"

"I don't think students should be pulled out of major subjects - but should be taken out of art, music, study - reading."

"I would like to see the children pulled out of reading only."

"This is the first year I have seen positive and immediate results from the program. I work with the Title I teacher, giving her the lessons for the day and she then reinforces the assignment with her students."

Respondents were then asked, "If an alternative to the pull-out model were to be used in your school, what alternative would you suggest?" A check-off list of five items was given with the opportunity to comment. Two non-Title I teachers gave more than one first choice (see the Table 37).

The greatest number of respondents (16) gave no response at all. The option selected most often was the NCEC program. Respondents looking for an alternative scheduling slot for Title I were divided as to when the time should be scheduled. In addition to the given options, other ideas included scheduling Title I in study periods. One teacher noted that his/her school had always scheduled Title I once a day along with English.

Table 37

Responses of Middle School Staffs to Alternatives to the Pull-Out Model

Alternative	School Administrator (N = 6)	Title I Teacher (N = 18)	Para (N = 9)	Non-Title I Teacher (N = 17)
Title I teacher working with the regular classroom teacher in the same classroom	17%	6%	-	24%
Title I paraprofessional working with regular teacher in the same classroom	-	6%	11%	12%
New Century Reading Lab (NCEC)	33%	17%	11%	18%
After school Title I program	17%	6%	-	24%
Summer school Title I program	17%	11%	11%	12%
No Response	17%	28%	66%	24%
Pullout preferred - no satisfactory alternative exists	-	11%	-	-
Other	-	18%	-	-

Four of the 17 non-Title I teachers said they preferred to have a Title I teacher working with the regular classroom teacher in the same classroom. Only one of 18 Title I teachers chose this option, however, and another said, "Never a Title I teacher in the same room with a regular teacher," though the respondent did not explain why.

2. Staff Development

Due to budget cuts three staff development positions have been eliminated this year. Remaining are two staff development personnel, one of

whom supervises elementary teachers while the other supervises secondary teachers. These two people spend the major portions of their time in schools assisting Title I teachers and professionals.

When teachers were asked what they would like to see offered in the area of staff development to help them function more effectively as Title I teachers, two teachers requested assistance in teaching methods.

- "More inservice time to instruct teachers on methods to be used."
- "Better utilization of independent work time for students , also better techniques of developing study skills."

On the other hand, two middle school teachers felt that staff development at this level is unnecessary.

- "Staff development is not necessary. It is fat that should be trimmed. We are all experienced teachers."
- "As the teachers at this point are all experienced - should be and will in the future be certified in reading, I think staff development people who at this point are not experienced in reading or the Title I program are a waste especially when all the assistant directors are certified in reading and can help us. We need help in motivation and discipline <u>not</u> reading methods or materials."

3. Parent Involvement

Because of a change in the federal law, the Parent Advisory Councils may not necessarily be required in each school. We asked headmasters if they thought parent involvement in Title I is important. Their responses are presented in Table 38.

Half of the headmasters responded that parent involvement is important. When asked to suggest methods of insuring parent participation if advisory councils were curtailed, two suggested sending notes, surveys and questionnaires home and one thought parent participation could take place at REPC meetings.

Table 38

Do you think that parent involvement in Title I is important?

N = 6 Middle School Headmasters

No	Unsure	Yes
17%	33%	50%

A Title I central administrator reported that parent involvement at the city-wide level must be encouraged. He credited parents with putting enough political pressure on Washington to keep Title I out of the block grants portion (Chapter II) of the new education law.

Summary Policy Issues Middle School Level

The pull-out model is supported at the middle school level, but not with the unanimity it had at the elementary level. One-third of the building administrators and about three-tenths of the Title I and non-Title I teachers think it should be replaced. Their general suggestion is that Title I should be scheduled as a regular class, so students are not pulled out of core subjects. Still, the majority of all groups wanted the pull-out model continued with little or no change.

Staff development was seen as less important at this level, especially with experienced and reading certified teachers. Topics suggested for inservice were ways to help students develop study skills and to teach them to better use their independent work time.

Parent involvement was seen as important by half the building administrators and several suggestions were given for obtaining it without PACs.

VI. HIGH SCHOOL

A. Program Description

1) High School Reading/Language Arts

In Districts II, III and VI the Reading/Language Arts School Program has been implemented in three high schools. There were 286 high school students enrolled in the program in these three districts.

The focus of the Title I project is on remediating the individual student, using various on-level reading and writing materials. Informal and standardized diagnostic tests are given to identify strengths and weaknesses. Teachers develop specific performance objectives for each student and individualize programs. Systematic lesson planning supports the individualized aspect of instruction. Students in the Reading/Language Arts component meet with their teacher and paraprofessional one period each day, five days a week for approximately 45 minutes each period, to the extent that scheduling permits.

By the end of the year, students are expected to increase reading and language scores as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 1978 edition, in reading and the California Achievement Test, Form C-D in language arts. Pre-tests were administered in October and post-tests will be administrered in May. The growth anticipated as a terminal measure is an increase of one normal curve equivalent score.

Specific objectives which the tests measure are stated below:

> Given a forty-five minute instructional period in reading, four days a week for thirty-five weeks, the Title I students will show an increase of one normal curve equivalent score, as measured by the appropriate levls of the Metropolitan Achievement Reading Survey Test.

Given an individualized forty-five minute instructional period in language arts, one day a week for thirty five weeks, the Title I students will show an increase of one normal curve equivalent score as measured by the appropriate level of the California Achievement Test, 1977-1978 Edition.

Date of Program Implementation

High School teachers surveyed were asked when the Title I program was fully implemented. Of six teachers responding to our questionnaire the majority responded that their Title I classes were underway in September. In one case, because student selection was made the previous spring, the Title I program began in early September.

Table 39

Date of Implementation of Title I programs at the High School Level

N of Teachers	Date
1	Beginning of September
3	Late Spetember
2	Early October

Classroom Observations

Six observations were made in three public and parochial high schools by the evaluation team. In four of the visits the evaluator spent a class period in the classroom. In one school where the evaluator had a lengthy interview with the headmaster the observations in a shared room were limited to ten minutes. In addition, informal interviews with 3 teachers, and one para-professional were made.

Facilities

The evaluator observed Title I classes taking place in a regular classroom, shared rooms and three small rooms off a library. Two of the small classrooms were crowded and seemed unsatisfactory to the evaluator. The teachers confirmed that it was difficult to teach in such a small space. In addition these rooms did not have the large blackboards, windows, and bulletin boards considered standard in educational settings. A breakdown of classroom types is shown below. In the table a room shared by two Title I classes was counted as two classrooms.

Table 40

Classroom Types for Title I at the High School level

Type of Facility	N	Percent
Regular Classroom	1	17%
Shared Room	2	33%
Small Room off Library	3	50%
Total	6 Classrooms	

Curriculum Materials

Curriculum materials in use during the evaluator's observations included library books, dictionaries, workbooks and worksheets. In one school students were reading Triple Takes, a Readers Digest series and Raintree Children's books. In a second school a curriculum developed by the high schools reading department was in use. In this school the Title I program is coordinated with the regular reading program. In the third school a secondary reading curriculum developed by the Title I teacher was being used. This curriculum included high interest, low vocabulary materials.

One teacher expressed a need for instructional materials at a lower level (i.e. especially at the third and fourth grade level). Another teacher expressed a need for tape recorders. This teacher felt tape recorders would be especially useful to bilingual students who need practice in hearing oral language.

Instructional Activities Observed

Table 41

Instructional Activities Observed

N = 6 Classrooms Observed

Activities	N	Percent
Staff assists students individually	6	100%
Small group instruction (2-4 students)	2	33%
Students work independently	5	83%

In all cases the staff were helping students individually and in five of the six classrooms the students were working independently. Small group instruction was observed in one third of the classrooms.

Paraprofessional Involvement

A paraprofessional was assisting in all six of the high school Title I classes observed by the evaluation team. During our visits paraprofessional activities included assisting individual students, correcting papers, accompanying students to the library and mimeographing worksheets. The table below highlights of the paraprofessional activities we saw taking place.

Table 42

Observed Paraprofessional Roles

N = 6 Observations

	N	Percent
Distributing and collecting materials	1	17%
Listening to pupils read	2	33%
Assisting individual students	4	67%
Correcting papers	5	83%
Accompanying students to the library	1	17%
Mimeographing worksheets	1	17%

Student Activities Observed

In each of the classrooms observed a variety of activities and interactions occurred. Although the dynamics and climate of the classroom cannot be reporduced here, we have recorded the specific types of student activities observed.

Table 43

Specific Student Activites Observed

N = 6 Visits

Activity	N	Percent
Oral Reading	2	33%
Silent Reading	5	83%
Using Workbooks	4	67%
Using Worksheets	4	67%
Conferring/Paraprofessional	3	50%
Conferring/Teacher	2	33%
Watching teacher at blackboard	1	17%

Silent reading was the most prevalent student activity, occuring in five of the six classrooms. Next in frequency was using worksheets and using workbooks. In only one classroom were students watching the teacher work at the blackboard.

Classroom Management

In one school Title I students had a contract with the teacher which specified the amount of work demanded to obtain a particular grade level. This method makes clear to students the level of work demanded and the level of reward (i.e. grades) that will be awarded. In this school Title I is a regular class and students receive a grade on the report card.

Summary of High School Title I Program

In the three districts studied there were three high schools and 286 Title I students enrolled. Most of the programs began in late September. Of the six classrooms observed three were small rooms off the library, two were shared classrooms and one was a large regular classroom.

In all classes observed the Title I staff assisted students individually. In five out of six classes the students were working independently. The paraprofessionals were for the most part correcting papers and assisting students individually. Less often observed activities included listening to students read, distributing and collecting materials, mimeographing worksheets, and accompanying students to the library.

Student activities in five of the six classes were silent reading. In four of the six the students were using workbooks and worksheets. Students were conferring with the paraprofessional in half of the classes and with the teacher in a third of the classes. Oral reading took place in one third of the classes.

B. Perceived Strengths of the Current High School Title I Program

In the High Schools being evaluated Title I teachers and para-professionals, administrators and non-Title I teachers were all sent questionnaires which asked their opinions about program strengths, cutbacks, and policy issues.

Table 44 showing the rate of response to these questionnaires is being repeated here to assure that the reader is aware of the number of responses on which this report is based.

Table 44*

High Schools

Response Rate of Questionnaires

Data Source	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Principal/Headmaster	3	1	33%
Title I Teacher	7	6	86%
Paraprofessionals	5	1	20%
Non-Title I Teachers	14	5	35%
Students	36	30	83%
TOTALS	65	43	66%

* This table is a repeat of Table 5, page 9.

There were a small number of responses at this level, though the rate of response among Title I teachers and students is excellent.

It is interesting that "individualized instruction", was not only mentioned most frequently by educators at all grade levels (both elementary and secondary), but was confirmed as the major strength of the program when

students themselves were asked. At the high school level, only one teacher mentioned student achievement as a strength. Instead, students and an administrator talked about "opportunities" to compare skills. It may be that at this school level, the students with the most chronic needs are those who are still left in the program and individualized, caring attention means more than curriculum, materials or test results.

Table 45

"What are the Major Strengths of the Title I Program"
High School Staff and Student Response

RESPONSES	Title I Teachers (N = 6)	Paras (N = 1)	School Admin. (N = 1)	Non-T.I Teachers (N = 5)	Students (N = 30)
Individualized instruction/ "extra help from teachers"/ "work explained so you can learn better".	17%	100%	-	40%	40%
Caring teachers	33%	-	-	40%	20%
Opportunity for students to improve skills.	-	-	100%	-	27%
Improvement in reading level	17%	-	-	-	-
Materials	33%	-	100%	-	-
Reinforcement in reading	-	-	-	40%	-
No responses	17%	-	-	20%	-
Other	33%	-	100%	-	-

C. Perceived Effects of FY1982 Cutbacks in Programs

The Boston Title I program was forced to cut back in FY1982 in response to a reduction in federal funding. As noted in the introduction to this report, some programs (such as Early Childhood) were completely eliminated. In the middle, and high school programs, as many teacher positions as possible were preserved, but the numbers of parprofessional and staff development positions were reduced, and all clerical aide positions were eliminated.

The Boston Title I Evaluation office asked us to determine the perceived effects of these cutbacks. This chapter describes the perceptions registered on questionnaires returned by Title I staff and school principals/headmasters. In some instances comments from interviews are also included.

1. Perceived Effects of Reduction of Paraprofessionals

Whereas previously each Title I teacher was assisted by a full-time paraprofessional, this year because of budget cuts, the number of paraprofessionals has been reduced. With a few exceptions, schools with a high percentage of low income children have full-time paraprofessionals and schools drawing from a lower poverty population have part-time paraprofessionals. Table 46 shows the number of teachers and paraprofessionals instructing in Districts II, III, and VI. As can be seen, all of the Title I teachers at the high school level have a full-time paraprofessional assisting them.

Table 46

Number of Teachers and Paraprofessionals

In Districts II, III, and VI

High Schools

	PUBLIC		PRIVATE	
DISTRICTS	Para's	T. I Teachers	Para's	T. I Teachers
II	4	4	0	0
III	0	0	0	0
VI	2	2	1	1

Table 47 presents the responses of the Title I teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators to the question about how the cut-back in paraprofessionals has affected their program. As can be seen, most see little if any effect on their program.

Table 47

"Has the reduction of paraprofessionals affected

your Title I program this year?"

High Schools

	N	Not at all	Somewhat	Seriously
Principals/Headmasters	1	100%	0%	0%
Title I Teachers	6	83%	17%	0%
Paraprofessionals	1	0%	100%	0%

Because of the low numbers of people responding it is difficult to comment on the results presented in Table 47. All of the Title I teachers

responding still have a full-time paraprofessional so it is reasonable for five of the six of them to see no effects of the cut-back in paraprofessionals this year.

2. Perceived Effect of Elimination of Clerical Aide Positions

When asked the degree to which their Title I programs were affected by cuts in clerical aide positions this year, the one responding high school Principal and five of the six teachers said "not at all".

Asked to note who had assumed responsibility for clerical tasks, most respondents indicated an arrangement for sharing the work. The teachers and paraprofessionals were most frequently involved, followed by Title I teacher alone, then paraprofessionals, then school secretary.

Table 48

"Has the elimination of clerical aides affected your Title I Program this year?"

Responses of High School Staff

	N	Not at all	Somewhat	Seriously
Principals/Headmasters	1	100%	0%	0%
Title I Teachers	6	83%	17%	0%

There was only one comment returned by a high school level respondent:

- "Where clerical aides had to service 3 or 4 or more schools, it was too impractical. The school where the aide was assigned was the primary recipient of those services in my estimation."

3. Perceptions of Staff Morale

In spite of Title I cutbacks this year and lay offs in other school programs staff responding to our survey rated morale high. (67% from teachers and 100% from the one responding principal.) The following table gives a breakdown of the responses.

Table 49

How would you rate the morale of the Title I staff in your school?

High Schools

	N	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very Low
Principals/Headmasters	1	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Title I Teachers	6	50%	17%	17%	0%	17%

In spite of the relatively high assessment of morale, however, it should be noted that 17% of the Title I teachers rated morale as very low. One teacher indicated that low morale among Title I teachers is a reflection of a city-wide problem.

- "The morale of most teachers in the Boston Schools has sagged. Title I teachers are not immune."

The majority of staff responding to the questionnaire rated morale high. Few comments were made suporting their answers.

Summary of Perceived Effects of Cut-backs

In general few effects of the cut-backs from last year were perceived at the high school level. Morale was high, the loss of the clerical aides was not missed, and no effects of reduction in paraprofessionals had been experienced.

D. High School Students Perceptions of the Title I Program

We surveyed a sampling of high school students to find out how they feel about the Title I Program. Their responses follow:

Table 50

High School Students Perceptions of the Title I Program

N = 30 High School Student Responses

MY TITLE I CLASS IS HELPING ME:	NOT A LOT	SOME	A GREAT DEAL	NO RESPONSE
Do better work in my other classes	10%	57%	30%	3%
Read better	0%	70%	30%	0%
Pay more attention in my classes	10%	43%	33%	14%
Become a better student	13%	33%	40%	14%
Come to school regularly	23%	20%	47%	10%
Stay in school and graduate	13%	20%	57%	10%
Feel better about myself	20%	33%	40%	3%

The students were asked about seven things, for each they were to indicate whether their Title I class helped them "not a lot", "some", or "a great deal". For all seven statements more than 30 percent of the students said that the Title I class helped them a great deal. The greatest agreement was with respect to reading better. All of the students responded that they are reading better because of Title I.

The Title I class was most likely (57%) to be seen as helping "a great deal" in terms of helping the student to stay in school and graduate, come to school regularly (47%), become a better student, and feel better about him or herself. Except for reading, a significant minority of the students felt that the Title I class was not a lot of help in these areas. For example, while

47 percent of the students felt that their Title I class helped them a great deal in coming to school regularly, another 23 percent did not feel that Title I encouraged regular attendance.

When students were asked how they felt about leaving their regular classes to come to Title I, we received the following:

Table 51

How do you feel about leaving your regular classes to come to Title I?

N = 30 High School Students

Don't Like It	It's Okay	Like It A lot	No Response
20%	33%	23%	23%

Table 51 indicates that while a substantial number (23%) of students like leaving their regular class a lot to go to Title I, about the same number (20%) do not like it. Almost one in four students gave no answer to this question. We can conclude that the students feel quite ambiguous about leaving their regular classes to attend Title I.

Finally, when the 30 students were asked what two things they think are good about the Title I Program, fourteen mentioned the help they receive from Title I teachers. Eight said that Title I classes assist them with reading and writing.

E. Policy Issues

This section of the high school Title I evaluation focuses on respondents views of certain policy issues regarding the future of the Title I program. At the high school level these issues are:

- o Should the Title I program use the PULL-OUT model or an alternative?
- o What should be done in terms of staff development for Title I?
- o How important is parent involvement at this school level?

1. What model should be used for Title I: PULL-OUT or an alternative?

In questionnaires, staff were asked if the pull-out model should continue as the major way of delivering Title I services. The results are presented in Table 52. The one building administrator who answered said that the pull-out model should be replaced, as did two of the five non-Title I teachers. On the other hand five of the six Title I teachers favored the pull-out with no changes, and one wanted it continued but with major changes. The one paraprofessional wanted pull-out continued with no changes.

Table 52

Should the pull-out model be continued?

High School Personnel

Respondents	N	No	Unsure	Yes, with major changes	Yes, with minor changes	Yes, with no changes
Principal	1	100%	-	-	-	-
Title I Teacher	6	-	-	17%	-	83%
Non-Title I Teacher	5	40%	20%	-	40%	-
Paraprofessional	1	-	-	-	-	100%

The following comments were the only ones made on the questionaires

Title I Teachers' Comments

"Students should be assigned to Title I as a regular subject."

"Pull-out is most effective."

Non-Title I Teacher's Comments

"Our school does not use pullout and I prefer our method."

"Title I would be more effective as a subject where students aren't missing other classes."

Respondents were then asked, "If an alternative to the pull-out model were to be used in <u>your</u> school, what alternative would you suggest?" A check list of five possibilities was given, with the opportunity to comment.

Two Title I teachers noted that in their school Title I is scheduled as a regular major credit and is not a pull-out. The students take Title I one period a day along with English. The Principal preferred having the Title I paraprofessional working with a regular teacher, as did one non-Title I teacher and one Title I teacher. The Paraprofessional and two Title I teachers did not check any of the alternatives, and one Title I teacher noted that she preferred the pull-out model.

We can thus conclude that at the high school level the pull-out model for Title I is not as popular as at the elementary level. The people opposed to the pull-out model prefer to assign Title I as a regularly scheduled course, and give academic credit for it. This is in fact the way it is being handled in some of the schools.

2. Staff Development Issues

When teachers were asked what they would like to see offered in the area of staff development to help them function more effectively as Title I teachers, two teachers suggested workshops with veteran teachers sharing ideas. Other suggestions were for techniques to use with low achievers, ideas for ESL students and a workshop to help regular classroom teachers to be more aware of how to help students read in the content areas.

- "More workshops to explore techniques and materials that have been successful with low achievers."
- "Ideas for E.S.L. students. My school is predominantly Spanish with low level readers."
- "Perhaps a workshop to help regular classroom teachers to be aware of helping students with reading in the content areas."

3. Parent Involvement

Only one comment on parent involvement was received. One principal said that parent involvement is not important at the high school level. "Not on secondary levels - students are very much 'on their own'".

Summary of Policy Issues

In general then, the pull-out model is less popular at the high school level than at the elementary level. While Title I personnel still favor it, the alternative model of scheduling Title I as a regular class along with English has gained considerable favor.

Staff development ideas relate to the need for English as a Second Language materials, and ways to teach low achievers. Also suggested was Title I workshops for regular subject matter teachers.

VII. SPECIAL PROGRAMS

A. NEW CENTURY EDUCATION CORPORATION READING LABS

Program Description

There are three NCEC labs in the three districts being evaluated. One is at the elementary level and two are in middle schools. A total of 516 pupils are enrolled in these three NCEC labs. A breakdown follows:

Table 53

Enrollments in NCEC Reading Labs in Evaluation Districts

District	Level	Schools	Number of Students
II	Middle	Lewis	131
VI	Middle	McCormick	230
VI	Elementary	Dever	155
Total number of students served			516

Each lab is staffed by two Title I teacher and two paraprofessionals. Students meet for forty-five minutes each day. Class size is thirty.

The following descriptions of facilities and procedures were based on a visit to one NCEC lab school.

Facilities

The NCEC lab is located in a large classroom and contains a set of thirty cubicles. Each cubicle contains a cassette tape player with two earphone jacks, a headphone set, a magic marker with special ink, and a chair.

Arranged around the sides of the room are tables with bins. In the bins are lessons, books, answer sheets, and audio cassettes. The bins are clearly labeled and organized so that students can find the appropriate lesson materials. In an adjacent small room is a large round table, several chairs, and various paperback books, magazines, and educational games.

On the bulletin board is a large display of the certificates of students who have obtained 15 points for completion of lab exercises, and a smaller display of polaroid pictures of children who have attained 30 or 90 points.

Observations

At the beginning of class about 28 students entered the room. Each student picked up set of lesson materials. Usually this consisted of a tape cassette, a Read-Achiever book, and an answer sheet. If necessary the student consulted his or her record book to see what lesson was next, or asked a teacher or paraprofessional for assistance.

After obtaining the lesson materials, the student went to a cubicle and inserted the tape cassette, plugged in the headphones, and put them on. Then he or she did what the taped voice instructed. Usually this was to open the Read Achiever book to an appropriate page, read a passage, and answer a question about it. The student would mark his or her answer on the answer sheet using the special magic marker. If the answer was correct, the ink in the marker interacted with a hidden mark on the answer sheet to produce a visible vertical bar in the answer box. If the answer was incorrect, no bar appeared. This gave the student immediate feedback about the correctness of his or her answer choice.

After completing a lesson, the teacher or paraprofessional checked the number of errors. They had a table which listed the number of allowable errors for each lesson. If the answer sheet had fewer than the number of allowable errors, the child received a point, the lesson was marked off in the child's individual folder, and he or she was directed to the next appropriate lesson. Generally a child seemed able to do one or two lessons during the class period.

When the child had trouble, he or she would raise a red paper flag located on the top of the cubicle, and a teacher or paraprofessional would give assistance. The most common types of problems had to do with the equipment not functioning properly or a child having a question about the lesson.

At the end of the period, each child returned any incomplete answer sheets to his or her own file folder, returned the lesson materials, and cleaned up the cubicle.

When a child had accumulated 15 points (one point per completed lesson), he or she would receive a special certificate, which was posted on the bulletin board display. If the child completed 30 or 90 points he or she would also have a polaroid picture taken while holding the certificate. The pictures were also posted on the bulletin board. Also, upon completion of 15 points, the next day the child would be "off" from the lab work, and could spend the period using the small room reading magazines, paper back books, or playing one of the educational games.

On the day the lab was observed, there were 25 children working in the lab, and two in the small room completing a jigsaw puzzle.

Reactions of Teaching Personnel

The roles of the teachers and paraprofessionals consisted mostly of organizing the material before the class arrived, putting out the children's individual folders, and making sure that all the lesson materials were in order. Most of the class period was occupied with assisting the children with their lessons, and repairing or replacing any defective equipment or materials. Spare tape players and headsets were stored in a large supply cabinet. Once the children were set up, the role of the staff consisted mostly of checking completed worksheets for the number of errors. If the child made no more than the allowable number of errors, he or she received a point and went on to the next lesson. If too many errors had been made the teacher either asked the child to redo the lesson, complete an equivalent parallel one, or take a diagnostic test.

The teachers noted that running a lab was quite different from teaching a regular Title I class. A Lab teacher was more an educational manager than an instructor. The teachers noted that they would like to have one period a week to do regular Title I type of instruction to get to know the students better and to help those who seemed to have difficulty adjusting to the lab. Of the about 150 students involved this year, only one had had great trouble adjusting to the lab equipment. Morale seemed good, and the four instructional personnel seemed to move like a well oiled machine managing the problems of the 25 children present during the period.

B. POTENTIALLY GIFTED PROGRAM (Holland School)

The Title I Potentially Gifted Program is a pilot program in the Holland School. This program is being evaluated because it is a pilot program even though the Holland School is in District V.

Program Description

The Title I Potentially Gifted Program was designed:

1. to identify students from disadvantaged areas who are behind academically but show signs of potential giftedness;
2. to remediate the weaknesses of these students in reading or math using an independent study curriculum method; and
3. to teach skills in the areas of researching and creativity, also using the independent study method.

The students were identified in October from among the pool of already identified regular Title I 4th and 5th grade students at the Holland. Ten students were identified for the Potentially Gifted program based on parent and teacher checklists and small group measures.

Each of these ten students receives regular Title I services five days a week for forty-five minutes per day. In addition, for three days each week the ten students in the Potentially Gifted receive an **additional** forty-five minutes of small group instruction. This additional instruction is divided into two classes with a ratio of five students with one teacher and one paraprofessional.

Through independent study projects utilizing the students' specific interests and strengths, the Performance Objectives aimed at each student's level were targeted to be met and exceeded. Researching skills and creativity skills were also to be taught.

To appropriately manage the Potentially Gifted program, Title I teachers were given two fourty-five minute planning periods per week.

Facilities

The evaluator interviewed the two teachers involved in this program, and observed two of the students working on special projects. There are two rooms involved, one is a self-contained, very large corner classroom with abundant light and space. The other is a large room, part of a "pod" of classrooms, somewhat separated from the others by bookcases and partitions.

Observations

The evaluator observed two children working on special projects and observed the special project of a third child who was not present. One child was painting the picture of Cedric Maxwell for his report on the basketball star. Another child was completing her report on the history of German Shepard dogs. The evaluator also saw a completed third project on Koala Bears. This project consisted of a written report, a picture, and a cassette tape recording of the student reading her report. Another child in the library doing independent research on her topic.

At the time of the observation, only nine children remained in the project, since one of the original ten had moved out of the city.

The curriculum in use emphasized researching skills, use of reference books such as encyclopedias, magazines or old newspaper columns from the library, and report design and preparation skills. The students' reports were well printed, without spelling errors or grammatical errors in the final versions.

The next topic will be map-reading skills and geographic terms and vocabulary. Later in the year the teachers plan to use special curricular materials for Gifted and Talented students obtained from Oklahoma.

Reactions of Teaching Personnel

Both teachers felt that this program offered a valuable model for other Title I efforts. They felt that some of the Title I children are gifted and that if remedial work can pull them up to level in terms of skills, independent work and leadership training can make them valuable students and people in subsequent years.

The evaluation plans for the project did not differ, according to the teachers, from those of regular Title I programs - in that NCE gains on standardized tests and the completion of the Title I objectives are to be the criteria for the success of the program.

VIII. SYSTEM-WIDE POLICY ISSUES

While policy issues have been discussed at each level, elementary, middle, and high school, there are some policy issues which must be discussed system-wide across the three levels. This chapter deals with two of these policy areas, first the reading certification issue and second, alternative strategies for cost cutting, if that is necessary.

A. Reading Certification Status of Current Title I Teachers

The State Department of Education has mandated that all Title I teachers be certified in reading by June of 1983. In June of 1982 the requirements for reading certification will include additional course and field work.

In response to this mandate the Boston Title I administration asked the evaluator to include information on the reading certification status of current Title I teachers.

All Title I teachers responding to questionnaires were asked to note:

- The number of years they have taught in the Boston Title I program.
- The number of years they have taught in the Boston Public Schools.
- Whether they are presently certified in reading.
- Whether they are presently working toward reading certification.

Table 54 on the next page, presents the results in tabular form and permits comparisons between responding Title I teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

Out of 74 Title I teachers answering this section, 40 (54%) reported they were certified in reading, and an additional 10 (14%) reported that they were working toward certification. One-third did not respond to this point or indicated that they were neither certified nor working toward certification.

Table 54

Reading Certification Status of Title I Teachers

Elementary
(N = 50)

Years in Boston Public Schools	N	Certified in Reading	Working on Reading Certification
1-5	2	1	-
6-10	4	2	2
11-20	34	16	6
20+	10	6	-
Subtotals	50	25	8

Middle
(N = 18)

1-5	2	1	-
6-10	4	2	-
11-20	12	7	1
20+	-	-	-
Subtotals	18	10	1

High School
(N = 6)

1-5	0	-	-
6-10	1	-	1
11-20	5	5	-
20+	-	-	-
Subtotals	6	5	1

Responses varied at the different school levels. Five of the six high school teachers said they were certified and the remaining one was working toward certification. Half of the 50 elementary school teachers said they were certified and of the remaining half, only eight (or 16 percent) said they were working toward certification.

Ten of the middle school teachers (or 55 percent) said they were certified in reading, but only one of the remaining eight reported working toward certification. That leaves seven (or 39 percent) who either did not respond or who are not working toward certification.

Thus the high school level had the highest proportion of reading certified teachers, with the elementary and middle having about half certified. The middle school level seems to have proportionately fewer of the uncertified teachers seeking certification.

Though respondents were not invited to make comments on this issue, several made negative comments anyhow, typified by one teacher's comment:

> "How can you successfully use a teacher in a given situation for several years then throw a roadblock regarding his qualifications to teach a subject by saying he must now have a reading certificate? This is pure hypocrisy."

Negative attitudes were also expressed by a few teachers during on-site visits and interviews. In one elementary school for instance, one of the three teachers was pursuing reading certification while the other two were not. The two complained that they didn't have the time, energy, or money to pursue reading certification after so many years in the Boston school system.

The opposite viewpoint was expressed by supporters however, as for instance in an interview with one reading certified teacher who said,

> "Title I teachers should be certified in reading. That's the subject they are teaching. Any professional should be updating his skills."

B. Potential Areas to Cut the Title I Program

In our informal interviews we asked many teachers and administrators what areas of the total Title I program they would cut if the federal government forced Boston to scale back the program. Several answers were common, and a few were original.

The most common areas mentioned were materials and supplies. Teachers felt that they generally had enough supplies and could go for a year or so with a lower amount. Mimeographing of worksheets would suffice some said.

A second area is administration. While the central administration was seen as providing valuable services, if cuts had to be made, many people felt that the central Title I administration should be reduced in size.

A third area was in the community liaison aides. Few teachers felt that they were central to the Title I effort.

Fourth were paraprofessionals. Many teachers felt that they could get along, if they had to, without their paraprofessional. This sentiment was stronger in our interviews at the secondary level. At the elementary level, the paraprofessionals were considered to be more essential to the operation of the program.

Further cuts could be made by cutting out whole grade levels. The secondary teachers and administrators were in favor of dropping the twelfth grade, and willing to drop the eleventh grade. However, they also felt that a student cannot really get behind in reading until at least the end of the third grade and so Title I should only start in the fourth grade. Elementary teachers were more likely to feel that the entire high school program should be dropped. There was a general consensus that the fourth through seventh grades were the core of the Title I program.

One administrator suggested that a "Triage" system be set up. This would involve classifying students into three categories. The first category, those reading above the 40th percentile, are not in need and should not receive Title I services. The second category would be those students who, for one reason or another, were unable to benefit from Title I services, even though they might score very low on the selection test. These students often have high absenteeism rates or for some other reason are unable to benefit from the special services of Title I. These students also would not receive Title I services. The third category would be students in need of the services, and who could benefit from it. They would be the only students in the Title I. Such a selection process would be quite different from that in place now, in that students should not be ranked in terms of "educational need" on one list according to their scores on the spring tests.

This administrator suggested that the judgement of whether or not a student could benefit from Title I could be made perhaps using absenteeism and classroom behavior as criteria. Students who are too unmotivated or unable to benefit from the program, should be dropped from Title I or not selected for the program no matter how low their scores. Thus in times of cut-backs, the Title I services should only be offered to those students who are able to use them effectively.

We also asked about the NCEC labs, since they cost about half as much to run as the regular Title I model. Many administrators felt that the labs would be a good idea, but worried about security of the equipment. Title I teachers generally indicated that they would rather not teach in the labs, since such work was mostly managing materials rather than instructing children. However the ability of the labs to reach more children for the same cost was a powerful argument in their favor.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: **The pull-out model should continue to be the major educational model used for Boston's Title I elementary programs.**

Discussion: The pull-out model seems to be working rather well in the schools we observed. Almost none of the elementary teachers and administrators we interviewed favored any other model over the pull-out. Specific objections were raised to several of the possible alternatives to pull-out models. All after school and Saturday programs would be difficult to implement since every school has a significant proportion of its student body bussed into the school. Also at the middle and high school levels many students have after school or Saturday part-time jobs.

Summer programs were felt to have difficulties in drawing students to them. They were also not especially cost effective since many auxiliary services would have to be provided and paid for by Title I.

Many teachers were concerned that due to historical reasons, many of the Title I paraprofessionals would not be sufficiently trained and experienced to do Title I work with students under the direction of a regular teacher in his or her classroom. Also the Boston Teachers Union contract does not allow paraprofessionals

to actually teach, but only to reinforce the teaching done by a teacher.

A major objection to having an itinerant Title I teacher go into the regular classroom to work with Title I students was that many of the materials and equipment used in Title I would either have to be carried about or would have to be duplicated in each regular classroom. Of the alternative models considered, however, the itinerant Title I teacher model was considered most desirable.

Recommendation 2: **At the secondary level, the pull-out model should be replaced with a model which involves scheduling the Title I services as a regularly scheduled class in which students receive credit on their report card.**

Discussion: At the secondary level Title I staff who have experience with the regularly scheduled class model seem to prefer it. A major advantage is that the students do not miss work in their regular classes. However, to implement this model the students must be identified in the spring when the schedules for the following year are set.

Recommendation 3: Several pilot programs testing non-pull-out models should be tried next year.

Discussion: Given the superintendent's concern, several alternatives to the pull-out model should be tried next year. These models should be carefully evaluated, and the student NCE gains, attendance, and teacher satisfaction with the various models should be compared with the pull-out model.

Recommendation 4: The New Century Education Corporation reading labs should be used in more schools.

Discussion: The NCEC labs have been found to be more effective in terms of student gain. The labs are more cost effective to run than are the regular small group instruction, with two teachers and two paraprofessionals able to handle up to 30 students per period or about 150 to 180 students per day. This is equivalent to four regular Title I teacher and paraprofessional teams, each teaching 40 students per day. In personnel costs, for a school with between 120 to 150 Title I students, the Lab model would require two Title I teachers and two paraprofessionals while the regular model would require four Title I teachers and four paraprofessionals. The personnel costs of running the Labs are about half that of running regular Title I classes.

Recommendation 5: NCEC Reading Labs should be operated to provide some auxiliary small group teacher-led instruction.

Discussion: In our discussions with lab teachers and para-professionals they noted that there was a morale issue with teaching in a Lab since the duties were different from regular Title I teaching. One problem with expanding the number of Labs is that not all Title I teachers enjoy running them. The teacher running a Lab is more an educational manager than a provider of direct instruction. However, we believe that the Labs can be structured so that regular Title I teachers can run them effectively and also continue to enjoy teaching students.

Our recommendation is that one period a day be devoted to small group instruction. The teacher would select students from among those regularly involved in the Lab program to participate in the small group experience. While such an experience would be clearly auxiliary to the major educational experience of the Lab, it would allow the teacher to get to know individual students better, and to keep his or her hand in active teaching. We see students being scheduled into the small group instruction only about once a week, with a very few students more often and some students not at all, depending on the teacher's judgement of their needs.

Recommendation 6: If total costs are to be reduced, the following components should be reduced:

a. Supplies and materials

b. Community Liaison Aides

c. Central Administrative Staff

d. Staff Development Personnel

e. Paraprofessionals at the Secondary Level

f. Title I teaching positions can be reduced through expanded use of NCEC Labs, reduction in the grades taught, or through reduction in the number of students due to eliminating those unable to benefit from Title I services..

Discussion: Most of the teachers we interviewed felt that supplies and materials are one area where some costs could be reduced. The pilot testing of new reading series, and other purchase of new materials can be put off or reduced.

The Community Liaison Aides were felt to not be central to the mission of Title I and parental involvement can be obtained in other ways.

There was a general feeling that if necessary, further administrative cuts could be supported, especially with a more experienced Title I faculty and with all Title I teachers becoming certified.

Similarly, if necessary, further cuts in the staff development personnel were felt to be supportable.

Paraprofessionals at the secondary level were felt to be less essential than at the elementary level, and while valuable, the program would still function

effectively with fewer of them.

If Title I students could be reached in a more cost-effective fashion using the NCEC Labs, or the number of students served was decreased by dropping grade levels or by dropping unmotivated students, then teaching slots could be reduced.

Recommendation 7: **Careful consideration should be given to the grade levels receiving Title I service.**

Discussion: While there seems to be general agreement that the grades 4 through 7 are most essential for Title I services, the national results for Title I indicate lower achievements for high school students and especially for the twelfth graders. Longitudinal studies should be examined to gauge the effectiveness of the early grade programs. Our own results in another school system indicated substantial longitudinal gains for a Title I early childhood program. However, dropping service to whole grades is certainly one possibility for reducing costs. Our current feeling is that service to grade 12 should be dropped, but we would prefer other actions such as expanding the NCEC Labs or eliminating unmotivated students to dropping service at other whole grades.

Recommendation 8: **Student selection alternatives should be explored, including the "triage" system.**

Discussion: While we are not necessarily convinced that teachers can reliably select students with greater promise of growth and more effective use of Title I services, it does seem reasonable that some students fail to gain with Title I services and including them in the program, is expensive and deprives more motivated students of valuable services. Our recommendation here is that such selection processes be clearly developed, and perhaps pilot tested in a few schools. We see excessive absenteeism and lack of discipline in class as possible criteria for exclusion of such students from Title I.

Recommendation 9: **At the elementary level Title I should continue to use different basal readers than those used in regular classrooms.**

Discussion: There was near unanimity on the part of elementary teachers, both Title I and non-Title I, that the reading series used in Title I should be different from that used in the regular program. Boredom of the students was the major consideration mentioned.

Recommendation 10: **The evaluation design should be modified at the secondary level so that larger numbers of schools and staff can be included.**

Discussion: We were unhappy that the numbers of respondents, observations and schools at the high school level were so few. The three evaluation districts include only three high schools. We feel that to appropriately evaluate the Boston Public Schools Secondary Title I program, the entire city should be included in the evaluation plan. A further difficulty with the three evaluation districts plan is that the districts chosen have an especially large representation of parochial schools, and so the findings are less than optimally representative of the Public school programs.